


THE SOCIALISTS WHO THEY ARE AND WHAT THEY STAND FOR

UC-NRLF



\$B 591 752




JOHN SPARGO

BERKELEY
LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



THE SOCIALISTS

WHO THEY ARE AND
WHAT THEY STAND FOR

THE CASE FOR SOCIALISM
PLAINLY STATED

BY

JOHN SPARGO

AUTHOR OF THE BITTER CRY OF THE CHILDREN, WHERE
WE STAND, FORCES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM
IN AMERICA, A SOCIALIST VIEW OF
MR. ROCKEFELLER, ETC.



CHICAGO
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
1908

COPYRIGHT 1906
BY
CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY



Hx96
S79

To

Henry L. Slobodin,

*A brave comrade and tireless worker for Socialism,
this little propaganda book is affectionately
inscribed*



"We are they whose bugle rings, that **all** wars
may cease;
We are they will pay the Kings their cruel price
for Peace;
We are they whose steadfast watchword is what
Christ did teach—
Each man for his brother first, and **Heaven**,
then, for each."

"We are they who will not falter—many swords
or few—
Till we make this earth the altar of a worship
new;
We are they who will not take from palace,
priest, or code,
A meaner law than 'Brotherhood'—a lower Lord
than God."

Edwin Arnold.



CONTENTS



	PAGE
I. Pertinent Questions - - -	7
II. Socialism Not a Scheme -	12
III. The Old Socialism and the New -	18
IV. The Socialist View of Social Evolution - - - -	21
V. Socialism Not a Theory of Economic Fatalism - - - -	26
VI. The Capitalist System and Class Divisions - - -	34
VII. Condition of the Workers - -	39
VIII. The Division of Wealth - -	44
IX. The Conflict of Class Interests -	52
X. The Individual Versus the Class	60
XI. Present Methods of Class Warfare	64
XII. To End Class Warfare - -	71
XIII. Social Versus Private Property -	77
XIV. The Relation of Public Ownership to Socialism - - -	86
XV. The Missing Spirit - - -	94
XVI. Some Objections Considered -	103
XVII. Conclusion - - - -	134
Appendices—	
I. A Dream Which Must Come True	140
II. A Suggested Course of Reading for Students of Socialism - -	144



THE SOCIALISTS

I

PERTINENT QUESTIONS

“Who are the Socialists?” and “What do they stand for?” are questions frequently heard in these days. We hear them on the streets, in the workshops, on the cars; wherever men and women congregate these questions, and others of a like nature, are heard.

It is perfectly right and proper that they should be asked, for unless the Socialists are understood how can they be fairly and intelligently judged? The Socialists are a growing force in this country. At the last election they polled 409,230 votes as against 96,931 in 1900, so that they increased their strength 322 per cent. in four years. The late Mark Hanna

saw this party growing at a tremendous, but steady, rate, and over and over again declared that in the course of a few years there must be a definite struggle upon a clear issue between the Republican Party and the Socialist Party. That prophecy may or may not be true—prophecy is a pretty risky business!—but it is certainly true that all the signs of the times seem to point that way.

In Germany the Socialists are rapidly growing in numbers and strength, and it is universally conceded, by friends and foes alike, that they are invariably on the side of peace, progress, and purity of government. In Italy, France, Belgium, England, and other European countries, the same thing is true. It is always known with absolute certainty what stand the Socialists will take upon any question involving the interests of the working class. They are always on the side of the workers in

their struggles for better conditions; they are always against the oppression of the weak by the strong. Even their opponents admit that the Socialists in all countries where they have any influence are doing more to promote international peace and goodwill than any other body of people, whether religious or political. And the same might be said of their influence on the side of decency and honesty in government. The Socialists are always the most implacable foes of corruption and graft. All our authorities who have gone to European cities to investigate the subject in connection with municipal problems have borne testimony to this fact. But we need not go to Europe for proof of this. Wherever in this country Socialists have been elected they have fearlessly and consistently exposed graft and corruption wherever found. Not long ago, for example, the wholesale corruption in Milwau-

kee attracted almost universal attention. The Socialists were in the vanguard of the fight for decent, honest government, and they elected several of their representatives. Ever since they have been elected these men have been resolutely pursuing the grafters and have done more to rescue the city from the clutches of the garroting boodlers than all the "Reform" parties Milwaukee ever had.

Now, it is not claimed for the Socialists that they are superior beings, better men and women than other people. They are not perfectionists. They do not take their stand on the side of the weak and oppressed, and against war and plunder of the public treasuries, because they are of a superior moral or intellectual order. No Socialist would make such a claim, and no sensible man or woman would believe him if he did. What, then, is the reason of this strange phenomenon—how shall we account for the

fact that a great world-wide party, counting its adherents by the million and constantly growing, a party that is gaining ground in all parts of Europe, America, Australia, Africa, and even Asia, should always be found enlisting all its strength on the side of Justice and Right? To answer these questions is the purpose of this little book.

II

SOCIALISM NOT A SCHEME

Socialism is not a plan, or scheme, which philosophers have evolved for re-shaping all the institutions of society. No Socialist can give specifications of the society of the future. With Hudibras, the Socialist might say:

“Reforming schemes are none of mine,
To mend the world is a vast design.
Like those who ply with little boat
To tug to them the ship afloat.”

In all ages of the world's recorded history there have been men who, dissatisfied with the existing order, have dreamed of an ideal social system. The stern Hebrew prophet, Isaiah, exultingly heralded the coming of an all-embracing world-peace when swords shall be beaten into plow-

shares and spears into pruninghooks, and the strife of nations forever cease. Plato, the wise Greek, conceived in his great mind an ideal Republic. Sir Thomas More, the martyr statesman of sixteenth century England, called the social state of his fancy Utopia. Campanella, the Italian monk, dreamed, in his prison cell, of the City of the Sun. The literature of the world abounds with such social visions as these, testifying to man's eternal discontent with and rebellion against inequality and injustice, and to a universal aspiration toward, and belief in, justice, equality and brotherhood.

Many of these fanciful descriptions of the ideal social state, from Plato's "Republic" to Bellamy's "Looking Backward" and Howells' "Altruria," contain much that appeals to the Socialist and in a general way corresponds to the Socialist criticism of existing society, and serves to picture objectively the possibility of the applica-

tion of the fundamental Socialist principle of common ownership and control to the life of the world. Because of this many earnest and well-meaning people have tried to hold Socialism responsible for the vagaries of these visionaries. They have seized upon certain features of these "cloud palaces for an ideal humanity", such as the community of wives advocated by Plato and Campanella, or the various ingenious devices of Bellamy's very mechanical and uninviting dream-world, and treated them as if they were essential features of the great modern Socialist movement. As a matter of fact, they bear no such relation to the Socialist movement, which must be judged by its authoritative literature and its programmes alone.

Now it happens that the word "Socialism" itself was first used, in the early part of the nineteenth century, to describe the "reforming schemes"

of Robert Owen, the great English philanthropist and social reformer. Owen was the ablest and most practical of the great number of social innovators produced in Europe by the combined influences of the French Revolution and the industrial revolution in England brought about by the introduction of great mechanical inventions. These would-be-world-builders had one thing in common, however much they disagreed about everything else. They all believed that the world could be re-shaped to the plan they desired. They knew that the dream of a perfect social system was ages and ages old, but believed that only human ignorance had stood in the way of its fulfillment. What the world needed, they thought, was a man of great inventive genius, or of divine inspiration, to show exactly how such a system could be arranged. Of course, every leader or aspirant to leadership believed him-

self to be the genius, or the divinely inspired agent, for whom the world had waited through the long centuries.

It seems strange and well nigh ridiculous nowadays to think of these men going around the world, as Robert Owen and his disciples did, visiting monarchs, congresses of monarchs, and parliaments, with models, maps and charts designed to show exactly how everything would be in the new social state. But we must not forget that we live in an age that is dominated by very different ideas of the universe and of human history from those with which they were familiar. Darwin had not then been heard of and the idea of special creation still held sway in men's minds. The view of social conditions commonly held was that God had so ordained them. Men and women were taught to be "content in the station whereto Almighty God had been pleased to call

them." The more daring said that man was responsible; that all the misery and strife in the world was due to human ignorance and sin. There was no conception of social evolution.

III

THE OLD SOCIALISM AND THE NEW

The development of the theory of evolution and its application to society came at a time when the miserable failure of the Utopian Socialist schemes had for the moment discredited the Socialist ideal. Some said that the Socialists were flying in the face of Providence; others said they were vainly struggling against human nature. But the new theory of life challenged all such criticisms as these, and, more important than that, gave new life to the Socialist ideal. The world which men had believed to be only a few thousand years old was shown to be immeasurably older; the life of mankind upon the earth was shown to have been spent under different forms of social relation,

growing naturally out of each other.

The old Socialism which consisted of ingenious but abortive attempts to create new social systems of pre-conceived design, to begin the world's history anew, and ignored the natural laws of progressive development, was dead. Science had shown the causes of the failure of the little communal islands which Owen and so many others sought to build and maintain in the hostile currents of the ocean of competition. It had destroyed for ever the idea that new social systems could be made to order. True, a few visionaries remained who still continued to make the effort. A few such belated survivals remain with us to this day, but the Socialist movement has nothing to do with their schemes. The new Socialism rose, Phoenix like, from the ashes of the old Utopian Socialism, or, in other words, the new scientific movement took the place of the old Utopian

movement when science demonstrated that the failure of the latter was due to its own inherent weaknesses.

IV

**THE SOCIALIST VIEW OF SOCIAL
EVOLUTION**

Modern Socialism, then, claims scientific parentage. It is, fundamentally, a theory of social evolution—a recognition of all that is comprehended in the wonderfully expressive phrase of Leibnitz: “The present is the child of the past, but it is the parent of the future.” We must be careful, however, to avoid the common error, into which even some Socialists have fallen, of confusing the terms Socialism and social evolution and regarding them as synonymous. There are various non-Socialist theories of social evolution, and while every Socialist believes in social evolution not every believer in social evolution believes in Socialism. The essential characteristic of the Social-

ist theory of social evolution is the idea variously termed "Economic Determinism;" "Historical Materialism;" "The Economic Interpretation of History" and "The Materialist Conception of History." Reduced to common everyday language, these academic terms mean simply that the direction and rate of social progress are decided mainly, though not wholly, by the economic conditions existing—principally the means of producing and distributing the means of life. It is perfectly obvious that the life of all human beings depends upon their securing a sufficient supply of certain absolute necessities, chief of which is food. Any very serious or far-reaching change in the methods by which these necessities are obtained, must, it is evident, seriously affect the whole life of man.

If, for example, it was not possible for the people of any country to produce necessities and luxuries, or a

surplus of necessities with which to buy luxuries, necessities only would be produced and there would be no luxuries. If the production of the actual necessities of life required the labor of all the people, affording them no opportunity for leisure, then all would have to work. There would be no such a thing as a leisured class enjoying the fruits of the toil of another class. Only the fact that it is possible for one man to produce more than it is necessary for him to consume, or its equivalent in marketable value, makes possible the division of society into classes of idlers and toilers, masters and slaves.

It is impossible in this little book to explain fully this theory of the development of society about which many elaborate and profound volumes have been written. It is only possible to indicate in a general way what its leading principles are. Without some idea of these it is just as impossible

to understand the Socialist movement as it would be to understand mathematics without a knowledge of the mathematical signs. If we take the theory and test it by applying it to a single event we shall be able to understand it more easily. Such a test will perhaps give us a better idea of the theory and its limitations than any exposition possible in these pages. We will take, therefore, an event of interest to us all—the discovery of the American continent by Christopher Columbus. Much has been written of the genius of Columbus, and his discovery has been celebrated by many writers as the glorious fruitage of a brilliant idea. A deeper insight into the history of the age in which he lived, however, shows that the idea itself was born out of certain economic conditions. The control by the Moors in Africa and the Turks in Europe of the only route of transit for European trade with

Hindustan, and their extortion of immense revenues from the traders through that control, created the necessity of a new route to the world's treasure land, and it was, therefore, the direct cause of the adventurous voyage of Columbus and his splendid discovery.

The same principle can be applied to every historical epoch, and to almost every important social or political change. The American Revolution, the Civil War and the war with Spain can be properly understood only when viewed in the light of economic conditions. Scarcely a move is made on the chessboard of international politics except at the promptings of economic considerations. This is now pretty generally recognized by the greatest historians and sociologists though few of them make known the fact—in many cases because they are unaware of it—that it is a cardinal principle of the Socialist philosophy.

V.

**SOCIALISM NOT A THEORY OF ECONOMIC
FATALISM**

At first this theory may appear to be harsh and repellant, destroying all man's individuality, making him a mere automaton, and involving a mechanical conception of social progress, a rigid economic fatalism. The theory is often criticised from this point of view and it must be confessed that the exaggerations of the theory by some Socialists are partly responsible for this. But Socialism does not rest upon any such fatalistic conception. If it did there would be no justification for the existence of a Socialist movement with its political party organization, its ceaseless propaganda, its press and constantly growing literature. Man is not only a

creature of his environment in common with the lower animals; unlike them, he is able, within certain limits, to change his environment. Reason, the sovereign attribute which makes him master of the universe, enables man to interpret the facts of his daily life, to understand the significance of constant changes in the conditions by which he is surrounded, and to seize upon the opportunities for the advancement of his comfort which those changes present. In a word, man is able to understand the great blind forces of progress, in some measure to direct them, and to profit by every change.

The age in which we live has been characterized by a tremendous change in the economic conditions of society. During the greater part of the nineteenth century the maxim, "Competition is the life of trade," was almost universally accepted as being well nigh axiomatic. The introduction of

machine production upon a large scale and the opening of great foreign markets made possible the phenomenal industrial and commercial development of England, which country remained for fully three-quarters of the nineteenth century the "workshop of the world." Unquestionably, the competition induced by the incentive of great profits which the new industrial conditions presented was an all important factor in the development of industry and commerce which led England to that position, and, subsequently, to the industrial awakening of other countries and their challenge of England's position. Competition was in a certain very real and definite sense the life of trade. It led to the elimination of the unfit by competitors more able to cope with difficulties, more enterprising and progressive and more responsive to the needs of consumers. The vast improvements made in the methods of production and dis-

tribution were, in the main, made under the urge of Competition's relentless demand for cheapness and efficiency.

The theoretic economists made the very natural mistake of regarding a transitory economic law as permanent. They did not realize that competition could only be the life of trade during a certain stage of its development, and that beyond that stage it could only mean death. There were a few economists, the precursors of the modern Socialist school, some of whom have been almost entirely forgotten, who recognized this. They pointed out that when a certain stage of development was reached, the small, ill-equipped establishments having given way to larger and better equipped establishments, competition would be found to be both useless and dangerous. The ruin of small industries by the greater efficiency of their larger competitors was due to the

ability of the latter to economize at every point by means of better machinery, more efficient management, larger capital, and so on. But competition between large well equipped concerns involved too great risks. Even for the successful competitor it proved to be a costly business, and the captains of industry and commerce found that competition ceased to be a desirable stimulant. Competition had served its purpose and ceased to be the life of trade.

Sixty years ago Karl Marx, greatest of the Socialist economists, predicted this end of the competitive regime, but was laughed to scorn by the economists who prostrated themselves at the shrine of competition. In words that, as Professor R. T. Ely has said, seem prophetic now, even to non-Socialists, he showed how the different industrial units would grow in magnitude through the absorption of smaller units and the extinction of

others, until in each branch of industry monopoly would ensue.* Long before the economists had come to attach serious importance to that prediction, the lords of industry and commerce realized it in their actual experiences. Today the defenders of capitalism are not engaged in praising competition, but in decrying it and upholding monopoly. The trust problem, which is the most significant economic issue of the opening of the twentieth century, marks the grave of competition and the fulfillment of the Socialist economist's prediction. With the exception of agriculture, in which, while not absent, concentration is less evident than elsewhere, the whole industrial and commercial life of the great nations is being rapidly concentrated into a comparatively small number of units. Even the retail trade, long thought to be exempt, is rapidly passing into the control of

*Capital, English Edition, p. 789.

large combinations of capital, while the small dealer only retains his footing by means of a desperate struggle and with returns smaller, in a great number of cases, than the average wage of artisans.

The Socialist points to this growth of monopoly in industry not merely for vindication of the prescient criticisms of Marx and other Socialist writers, but also, and more particularly, to make clear the point that the economic changes noted make possible and necessary the social and political change to an industrial democracy which earlier Utopian dreamers advocated in vain because the necessary economic conditions did not yet exist. The transformation of countless small industrial and commercial concerns from private to public property was impossible, but the transformation of great industrial monopolies to public or social monopolies is not only possible, but appeals

to all save those immediately interested in them, as profit takers, as the only means whereby their interests may be safeguarded. The trust marks the point in the development of the capitalist system at which it becomes possible for the citizens of the country to socialize industry without loss of efficiency. The end of the capitalist regime and the inauguration of Socialism becomes now a matter for the intelligent agreement of the people.

VI.

**THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM AND CLASS
DIVISIONS**

Capitalism, or the capitalist system, is that industrial and social system in which the production of goods is carried on, not primarily for the use and enjoyment of the producers and their families, but by wage-paid laborers for the profit of a class of employers and traders. This system, seen in embryo in the workshop system of the non-chartered towns of Europe in the latter half of the sixteenth century, became the dominant system with the industrial revolution of the latter part of the eighteenth century. Only machinery and a highly scientific division of labor made its development possible. The essential features of capitalism, then, are: (1) Production for

sale and profit instead of for use; (2) The existence of a wage-paying class owning the tools and other means of production used by others, and a wage-receiving class using the tools owned by others in the interests of the tool-owners.

To many people, especially Americans, any reference to class divisions is exceedingly disagreeable, and acts as a red rag is supposed to act upon the nerves of a bad tempered bull. They are perfectly willing to admit that classes existed in ancient times, under the slave system and the later feudal system which bound the serf to the soil. They admit the existence of classes at the present time in the countries of the old world where more or less of the feudal traditions exist, but they do not willingly admit the existence of class divisions, similar in all essential respects, in twentieth century America.

This is perfectly natural, for, super-

ficially, conditions in the United States are different from conditions in Russia, Germany, or even England. We have no hereditary monarchy; no titled aristocracy; no State Church. The Constitution, the foundation of our political system, guarantees freedom and equality to all. Politically, the poorest man is theoretically equal to the richest in the land, and the humblest child born has equal chance with every other child of becoming the head of our government. It is not easy for men and women reared in such a country, and educated to such views as these, to realize that just as the class division which existed under the ancient slave systems existed, but in a slightly changed form, under the feudal regime in which the serf depended upon the owner of the soil, so it exists under capitalism, in the relation of employer and employee. For, as in each of the previous systems, the means upon which one

man's life depends is owned by another who exacts service for access to those means.

But the fact of class divisions in America has in recent years become too obvious to be seriously questioned. On the one hand we see a comparatively small number of men and women of fabulous wealth, whose riotous luxury excels anything of which history bears any record, and, on the other hand, the great mass of the wealth producers, the wage earners, forced to live close to the margin of bare existence. Against the colossal and unimaginable fortunes of our multimillionaires of the type represented by Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Carnegie, we have the spectacle of the most appalling poverty. Even in the heyday of our so-called prosperity we have the bitter cry of "ten millions in poverty," with all that is implied in that cry—the hunger of babes, the heavy burdens borne by

wearied mothers, the grinding of child lives into profits, the hopeless despair of unemployed men, the tragic misery of the aged and toilworn outcasts of industrial society. Moreover, these class divisions tend to become hereditarily fixed as firmly as the hereditary castes of the old world are fixed. By the very magnitude of the vast fortunes which its members must bequeath to their sons, the ruling class tends to become hereditarily fixed. Likewise the vastness of these fortunes removes their possessors so far from the most favored members of the working class as law and custom keep the monarchs of the old world and their subjects from each other. The chances of a worker entering the ruling class are rapidly becoming just as small and negligible under our new plutocracy as in any of the European monarchies.

VII.

CONDITION OF THE WORKERS

Bearing in mind that the workers are the producers of all wealth, that every vestige of our national prosperity and greatness is born of their labor of hand and brain, let us turn for a moment to the condition of the working class. According to the United States census of 1900, of the 16,187,715 families in the United States only 31.8 per cent. own their own homes. No less than 68.2 per cent. of the total number of families live in homes that are either hired by the week or the month or mortgaged. It is safe and conservative to say that at least 80 per cent. of all the wage-earners of America—and at least 90 per cent. of those who live in the cities—have no homes except

those that are hired by the week or the month. As they hire their homes so they themselves are hired by the day or by the week, and are without security of employment. An employer's whim, the introduction of a new industrial process, or an improved machine, the success of a rival firm, a political change in some foreign land,—causes as impersonal as these will throw the average wage-worker into the ranks of the unemployed without an hour's warning. With wages barely sufficient to provide the actual necessities of life, a month's sickness suffices to reduce tens of thousands of the wage-earning class to destitution and pauperism. A prolonged sickness, or an accident, brings even the most favored and prudent of the workers to that deplorable condition. When, exhausted by excessive toil and the fierce struggle for existence, they are no longer able to keep pace with younger, more virile competitors,

and are cast aside as so much industrial waste, few are the workers who are able to rest in peaceful security upon the savings of their working years.

In Europe it has been found that 90 per cent. of the working class families in which the breadwinners are injured need charitable relief, and though, as Mr. Robert Hunter suggests, the proportion would probably be less in this country, there can be no doubt whatever that industrial accidents are responsible for a tremendous amount of poverty. There is no reliable record of the number of such accidents in the United States year by year, but Mr. Frederick L. Hoffman, of the Prudential Insurance Company, has estimated that at least 1,664,000 persons are annually killed or more or less seriously injured in the United States.* That the great majority of these accidents occur

*Cf. *Poverty*, by Robert Hunter, p. 344.

among members of the wage-earning class, and consequently involve hardship and poverty to those dependent on their earnings, is indisputable.

So, too, with sickness. The conditions under which the workers live and toil are responsible for an appalling amount of sickness. The ill-nourished, ill-clad, toil-worn bodies of the proletariat succumb most readily to the ravages of pneumonia, the disease which has been aptly called "The Captain of the Men of Death." Tuberculosis, also, is universally recognized by the medical profession to be a disease of the masses. Living in crowded, ill-ventilated tenements, working in the dust-laden atmosphere of factories and mines, toiling excessively and receiving insufficient nourishment and rest, the wage-working class furnishes the Great White Plague with a majority of its victims.

These are but a few of the evils from which the workers suffer. No

wonder that so many of them seek the solace of forgetfulness in strong drink, as if responding to the Biblical injunction, "Let him drink, and forget his poverty. And remember his misery no more." No wonder, either, that in our richest and greatest city, where the money power of the world centers and Mammon's temples are thronged with eager votaries, one person out of every ten that die must lie in the grave of pauperism and failure in Potter's Field!

VIII.

THE DIVISION OF WEALTH


This poverty of the workers is not due to their failure as producers. There is no such a thing as a poverty problem in the sense that not enough wealth is produced to supply all the needs of the nation. The existence of a social class of excessive wealth, the members of which vie with one another in wanton display of luxury, is a sufficient living proof of this. While Mr. Rockefeller has an income of more than sixty million dollars a year—a sum far greater than the combined incomes of all the crowned heads of Europe and the presidents of the United States and France—and another man starves to death because he is unable to buy food enough to

keep his body alive, it is evident that the problem must be one of unequal distribution rather than inadequate production.

This inequality of distribution is too apparent not to be generally recognized. It is the one unquestioned and unquestionable fact of the modern social problem. Some economists have tried to justify the inequality, but none ever dreams of questioning its existence. Many attempts have been made to express scientifically, in statistical form, the measure of this inequality, but the subject is one which bristles with difficulties. The late Charles B. Spahr, in his well-known work, *The Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States*, came to the conclusion that seven-eighths of the families of the United States owned no more than one-eighth of the national wealth, and that one per cent of the families held more of the national wealth than

the remaining ninety-nine per cent. The following diagram will make the significance of these figures apparent at a glance:

DIAGRAM SHOWING DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH
IN U. S. (Spahr's Estimate.)



Seven-eighths of the
families in the U.S. own
only one-eighth of
the wealth.

Dr. Spahr's work was published in 1896 and his figures are therefore somewhat out of date. We may be quite sure, however, that the disparity in the distribution of the nation's wealth has not lessened since that time. The United States census au-

thorities do not publish any calculations upon this subject as they once did, so we must depend upon the results reached by independent statisticians who have taken the trouble to make such calculations from the mass of crude data contained in the census reports. Mr. Lucien Sanial, a competent statistical authority, has published some interesting calculations of this nature. He divides society into two great economic classes, the Capitalist Class, consisting of "all the persons who own in some form any portion whatever of the natural and mechanical agencies required by human labor for the production of wealth," and the Proletarian Class, consisting of those who own "nothing but their labor-power."

The capitalist class Mr. Sanial divides into two classes, "mutually antagonistic, yet equally determined to maintain at all hazards the capitalist system"—the system of private prop-

erty in the means of production, and wage-paid labor. So that, according to Mr. Sanial's division, we have three classes, made up as follows: (1) The Plutocracy, composed of wealthy bankers, railway magnates, corporation directors, trust magnates, and the like; (2) The Middle Class, composed of farmers, small manufacturers, merchants, professional men, and so on; (3) The Proletariat, composed chiefly of wage-workers and a small proportion of the professional class.

This division, it must be confessed, is open to serious objections, as, indeed, all such arbitrary groupings of economic interests must be. For example, a large and increasing number of farmers and traders are in substantially the same position as the wage-workers, and their political and economic interests are with these rather than with the capitalists. The tenant farmer who receives in return for the labor of himself and wife, and,

often, the other members of his family, less than the wages of his hired man, cannot well be considered as belonging to a higher economic category than the man he employs. The same is true of the small storekeeper. In defense of Mr. Sanial's classification it may be said that, as yet, these farmers and small traders do not recognize the identity of their interests with those of the wage-workers, though here again it is necessary to recognize the fact that the farmers seem just as ready to ally themselves with the political movement of the working class, the Socialist Party, as the wage-earners of the cities. No one who has been privileged to compare the Socialist movement in the great agricultural communities of the United States with that of the industrial centers can deny that a very large number of farmers do regard themselves as being, in all essentials, proletarians.

With these reservations in mind, let us return to Mr. Sanial's figures. He gives the number of the Plutocratic Class as 250,251, of the Middle Class as 8,429,845, and of the Proletariat, or working class, as 20,393,137. The respective share of each of these classes in the total wealth of the country, as compared with its number of occupied persons, is shown in the following diagram and explanatory table:

SHARE OF EACH CLASS IN THE TOTAL WEALTH

AS COMPARED WITH ITS NUMBER OF OCCUPIED PERSONS 10 YEARS AND OVER.

Plutocratic Class
\$67,000,000,000

Middle Class
\$24,000,000,000

**PROLETARIAN
CLASS**
\$4,000,000,000

THE DIVISION OF WEALTH

CLASS	NUMBER OF PERSONS IN EACH CLASS	PER CENT OF TOTAL NUMBER IN OCCUPATIONS	Wealth of Each Class	PER CENT. OF TOTAL WEALTH
Plutocratic Class .	250,251	0.9	\$67,000,000,000	70.5
Middle Class . . .	8,429,845	29.0	24,000,000,000	25.3
Proletarian Class .	20,393,137	70.1	4,000,000,000	4.2
Total . . .	29,073,233	100.0	\$95,000,000,000	100.0

IX.

THE CONFLICT OF CLASS INTERESTS

It is this great inequality in the distribution of wealth which gives rise to and inspires the conflict of the classes, the Class Struggle which forms such an important feature of the philosophy of Socialism and which so many earnest men and women find it difficult, if not altogether impossible, to accept. No other phase of the philosophy and propaganda of Socialism has been so much misunderstood, or so vehemently denounced and misrepresented, as this idea that changes in the basic economic conditions of life create distinct class divisions in society, and that the real social and political advances which mark the evolution of society are made through the urge and impulse

of the resulting inevitable struggles between these classes for mastery.

Now, while it may be, and is easily explainable, this is greatly to be deplored. It is always regrettable when thoughtful men and women who are earnestly seeking the truth are prejudiced against an idea or a movement through some misconception of it. In the belief that many such persons are today opposing Socialism because of their total misconception of what it really means, this attempt is made to state plainly, honestly and without acrimony or offense what Socialists understand by the class struggle.

In the first place, reverting for a moment to the unequal division of wealth already shown, it is obvious that the wealth producers who receive such a small share of the products of their toil have a certain community of interests as against the recipients of the larger share. The individual workers in a factory or mine may be

divided by a thousand different things. They may be of different races, they may have different religious beliefs, but they have one thing in common—they have a common interest in securing as large a return for their labor, as big a share of their products, as possible. There will be a natural tendency, therefore, for them to unite upon that one question. It would be impossible to get them to agree upon any question involving the merits of their respective nationalities; to attempt to unite them in any religious organization would be foredoomed to failure. But in general they will unite, more or less readily, upon the platform of their economic interests.

In like manner, those who receive the larger share, so enormously disproportionate to their numbers, may also differ upon all other matters, but they will tend to agree as to the desirability of maintaining the present division of wealth, of increasing their

share if possible, and, at any rate, preventing its being lessened by any coercive action on the part of the workers. They, too, may be of different races and have different religious beliefs, and because of these things they may belong to different clubs and social "sets," but they will find a basis for common agreement in their economic interests.

In the foregoing proposition care has been taken to confine the statement to its necessary limitations. It is claimed merely that there will be a tendency for this unity upon a basis of economic interests to occur. There may be individuals so constituted that they are not able or willing to unite with their fellows upon anything. There may be some who will not be able to recognize that they have common interests with their fellows. There may be some who will regard racial or religious divisions as being vital to the extent of forbidding any

association with others of alien race or faith. Finally, there may be and in fact are, some members of the superior economic class who regard the system which gives them so disproportionate a share of the wealth of the world as wrong and unite with the workers instead of their natural allies. But all these are exceptions, and in general it may be said that men will unite according to their economic interests while preserving other natural divisions, because the economic question is fundamental. It is the bottom question of life—the question of food and clothes and shelter. That some rise superior to their environment does not invalidate the theory that life is in general conditioned by its environment.

All this is very trite and obvious, but it goes to the roots of the problem before us. Association for mutual protection is a law of nature which men everywhere, and most of

the lower animals, instinctively obey. When the individuals find themselves powerless to defend their interests they instinctively unite. Prince Kropotkin in his wonderful book, *Mutual Aid a Factor of Evolution*, gives many interesting examples, human and other, of the observance of this law. The struggle of the classes, then, is a natural struggle, the working out of a great universal natural law. It is imperative that this be remembered by those who would understand Socialism and its propaganda. Many people make the serious mistake of supposing that Socialism is responsible for the class struggle, that the advocates of Socialism, by preaching bitterness and class hatred, make the class struggle. Because they believe this they oppose Socialism and denounce its advocates with all their powers.

This is unfair to the Socialists. They do not make the struggle which

exists between the classes, but it inheres in the economic institutions of society. Long before the word Socialism was ever spoken society was torn by a bitter class conflict. In fact, ever since in the evolution of the race private property first became recognized, class struggles have existed. Their history is the history of human progress. Ancient society, based as it was upon slavery, was certainly characterized by a definite class division. Slavery was in fact the beginning of the age-long universal class struggle between the disinherited sons of earth and their masters. The ancient histories teem with records of the revolts of slaves against their masters. Likewise the history of the Middle Ages tells mainly the story of a great and bitterly-waged class struggle. No candid reader of the history of the period can fail to find abundant evidence of the responsibility of conflicting class interests for

the wars of the Middle Ages. The medieval guilds, also, were the organized expression of the struggle of the rising manufacturing class against the feudal barons. When Socialists are accused of creating class division and strife, the accusation is as absurd as it is unjust. Upon the walls of Pompeii—which seems, says Mr. Morrison Davidson, to have been in the midst of a municipal election when it was buried in the year 79 A. D.—inscriptions have been found pointing to a definite organization of the working class at that time.* Here is one such inscription, interesting on account of the present discussion of the desirability of the labor unions going into politics:

“THE MEMBERS OF THE FISHERMEN’S UNION NOMINATE POPEDIUS RUFUS FOR MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF WORKS.”

*The Annals of Toil, by J. Morrison Davidson, p. 6.

X

THE INDIVIDUAL VERSUS THE CLASS

Because the class struggle is a direct result of those economic divisions which are naturally developed in the course of social evolution, it follows that individuals are not responsible for their part in that struggle in any great degree. The Socialist is often represented as a narrow, bitter, intolerant fanatic who believes that all capitalists are wicked and inhuman, and that only workingmen are good. What the Socialist really does believe is that the class struggle is not a question of ethics at all, or only indirectly and incidentally so, and that, generally speaking, if the workers and the capitalists could change places each class would act in just the same manner as the other

now does. When, therefore, a great industrial war takes place, the Socialist does not talk about the "wicked capitalists," nor about the "good workmen." He simply sees in the war a natural result of conditions for which neither side is directly responsible.

Strange as it may seem, the Socialists are forever seeking to end this class conflict, which they deplore as much as any of their critics. Even when to a superficial observer they seem to be doing their best to increase the intensity of the strife by calling upon the workers to more vigorous warfare, they are in reality aiming at the ending of the struggle once and for all. At present the struggle is being waged upon the industrial field. There are large, well equipped organizations of employers and employed constantly fighting each other. If the workers in a factory or mine are dissatisfied with their conditions, either because their pay is too little,

their hours of labor too many, or their surroundings unpleasant or unsafe, they realize that as individuals they have no power to enforce any demands they may make for better conditions, and that if they make such demands they are liable to dismissal. They make their demands, therefore, collectively, through the unions which they have formed as a result of their recognition of this individual helplessness. Now, it is not always a question of goodwill with employers whether or not they will grant the demands of their employees. The maintenance of their business at what they consider to be a fair rate of profit may preclude them from paying higher wages, lessening the hours of employment, or investing capital in improvements of their factories. In competitive industries, and especially when wages figure as the principal item in the total cost of production, the individual employer who has to

pay higher wages than his competitors is not infrequently ruined. In addition, there is always the fact that employers have a natural class interest in resisting the demands of the workers.

IX

PRESENT METHODS OF CLASS WARFARE

In general, the methods of warfare resorted to may be summed up as follows: The workers resort to the strike or the boycott and the employers to the lockout or the blacklist—the latter being simply a boycott of unionism. Sometimes when the workers strike in one shop or factory the employers in that industry resort to a general lockout. Sometimes the employers take the initiative and meet the demands of their employees, and their threats to strike, by instituting a general lockout beforehand, the unions retaliating by means of a more or less ineffective and futile boycott. It is essentially a guerilla warfare that is waged.

A candid study of the facts as they

are reported in the press, and the reports of the various unions, as well as the facts which appear to personal observation, forces the observer to the conclusion that in this warfare the burden of suffering and discomfort invariably falls upon the workers. Whenever a prolonged strike occurs, even though they win, the workers suffer hardships and privations that are entirely disproportionate to any inconvenience the employers may feel. This is universally recognized. There is, however, another party that is forced to suffer, despite the fact that it has neither part nor lot in the quarrel. The public suffers inconvenience, and often real hardship, as in the case of the great coal strike of 1902, even though it may not know the issues of the dispute, as sometimes happens, or knows them only imperfectly.

Not only are the workers at a natural disadvantage in this guerilla war-

fare against the owners of the machinery of wealth production, but the employers have adopted a more scientific method of fighting which cannot be matched by strikes or boycotts. They have seized the machinery of government in all its branches, legislative, executive and judicial, to fight the workers. The executive and judicial powers especially have been suborned to these purposes. Laws proposed in the interests of the workers are fought in the legislative halls and defeated wherever possible. When it is found to be impossible to do this, and laws favorable to labor are enacted, the judicial powers are resorted to for the purpose of defeating the intentions of the legislators by declaring the laws unconstitutional. The prevailing rate of wages law in New York, in 1901, the eight-hour law in Ohio, in 1902, and the ten-hour law as applied to bakeshops in New York, in 1905, are notable instances of what

generally happens. It is nowadays regarded as being fairly certain that any law which may be passed favorable to the workers in their struggle will be declared unconstitutional.

Even more effective has been the use of the judicial injunction. The sinister phrase, "Government by Injunction," mocks the fine rhetorical phrases of the Declaration of Independence. When the judiciary of any country can forbid citizens to do what they have a perfect legal right to do, or to compel men to do what they have a perfect legal right to refrain from doing, Liberty is outraged and Justice is violated in the temple. Says Mr. John Mitchell: "No weapon has been used with such disastrous effect against trade unions as the injunction in labor disputes. By means of it trade unionists have been prohibited under severe penalties from doing what they had a legal right to do, and have been specifically directed to

do what they had a legal right not to do. It is difficult to speak in measured language of the savagery and venom with which unions have been assailed by the injunction, and to the working classes, as to all fair-minded men, it seems little less than a crime to condone or tolerate it.”*

What could be more revolting to the American sense of justice and fairplay than the enjoining of men engaged in a great struggle involving a third party, in this case the public, powerful to help or hinder their cause, from publishing their side of the controversy and appealing for the support of that powerful party? Yet this has been done time and again without effective protest.

Finally, the organizations of the workers, the labor unions, have been attacked in a vital part—their treasuries. When the members of a British trade union, the Amalgamated Society

*Organized Labor, by John Mitchell, p. 324.

of Railway Servants, were compelled by the courts to pay to the Taff Vale Railway Company, against which members of the society had waged a strike in the usual regular manner, \$115,000 to compensate the company for losses sustained through the strike, it was not long before similar actions were begun in various parts of this country. The members of the local lodge of the Machinists' union in Rutland, Vermont, were ordered to pay \$2,500 to an employer against whom they had conducted a strike, upon precisely the same grounds as the English union had to pay. Since then there have been many similar decisions given in the courts in various parts of the country. Under these conditions it is practically impossible for a union either to strike with any advantage to its members or to possess any funds. It is, manifestly, of little use for workers to strike if they are to be compelled to

pay those against whom they strike for any damages they may inflict upon them by striking.

When to the foregoing conditions is added the use of the police powers—policemen and state and federal troops—against them in almost every industrial dispute, regardless of the merits of the struggle, the forces arrayed against the workers, the odds against which they are fighting, seem insurmountable. Disadvantaged economically at the very start, they have to contend against the gigantic political odds consequent upon the control of the agencies of government being in the hands of their enemies.

XII.

TO END CLASS WARFARE

To end this class warfare is the conscious aim of the Socialist movement. Socialists are not aiming, as many people suppose, to overthrow the rule of the master class merely to set up the rule of another class in its place. It is not a question of changing the position of the classes, but of destroying class rule once and for all. That is the ultimate aim, the goal, of the Socialist movement of the world. Socialists believe that the present guerilla warfare, which injures most of all the workers and their families, should give place to other and saner methods. They believe that we should aim at the permanent solution of the issue upon which the

classes divide in the only way that is possible, namely, the removal of the fundamental cause of the division and struggle. That, as we have seen, is the system of private ownership in the means of production and exchange and their use for profit. This system of capitalism has played its part—an important part—in the development of society. Now it is no longer necessary nor adapted to the needs of social development. Moreover, it is plainly and rapidly disintegrating, and it is, Socialists believe, possible to end it without bringing upon society any of the lamentable evils which follow upon attempts to abrogate, or interfere with, the great universal laws of evolution.

The Socialist, then, advocates the organization of the workers politically for this purpose. The organization may be, and, most Socialists think, should be, economic as well as political. But the political organ-

ization is imperative. The strike and boycott need not be repudiated as weapons. They may be used in conjunction with the political weapon. They may still be mainly depended on for the immediate economic struggle, or they may be used to supplement the political attack. We may yet have mass strikes of the workers engaged in the staple industries for political purposes. Nor must the mistake be made of supposing that this Socialist view of the position of the workers in the great class struggle affords no immediate hope to them, promising nothing now but everything ultimately through the solution of the whole problem of economic inequality and class divisions. Such political organization as the Socialists advocate must inevitably bring great immediate advantages to the workers. It is easy to see, for instance, that the control of the legislature would make it possible for them to enact

legislation for their immediate advantage. Even a partial control, the possession of a strong minority party in the legislature, would enable them to demand effectively important concessions as well as to prevent many of the outrageous abuses to which they are at present subjected. If they destroyed the capitalist control of the judiciary they would be able to safeguard their organizations against injunctions, damage suits, and other insidious forms of capitalist aggression which are now rendering them impotent.

There can be no question as to the political power of the working class whenever its members choose to exert it. Their votes far outnumber the combined votes of the great so-called middle class and the small plutocratic class. If these class lines were closely drawn in politics, the workers uniting against the plutocrats and the middle class, their relative

strength would be about as shown in the following diagram:




DIAGRAM SHOWING RELATIVE VOTING
STRENGTH OF THE CLASSES

(The long black portion represents the vote of the Workers.)

Now that we have seen what the Socialist theory of the class struggle really means, let us see what position its opponents must take if they are to refute it. They may contend: (1) That there is no class struggle in modern society; or (2) that the class struggle which exists is not the result of natural economic causes, but that individuals are responsible for it; (3) that the continuance of the present guerilla warfare of the classes is desirable, and that the Socialists are wrong in trying to end it; (4) that

the Socialist contention that the end of the class struggle is dependent on the end of the capitalist system is wrong. If any one of these four contentions could be established the Socialists would be compelled to change their position upon this fundamental question. Up to the present, however, no serious attempt has been made to maintain any of these positions, those who have entered upon that field contributing unwittingly either to the propaganda of Socialism or to the amusement of mankind.

XIII.

SOCIAL VERSUS PRIVATE PROPERTY

Socialism is frequently defined as "the social ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange." The brief descriptions of the meanings of words which we call definitions are proverbially misleading, and this definition is no exception to the rule. As we have seen, Socialism is much more than a movement aiming at the socialization of the means of production, distribution and exchange. It is a philosophy of history, a theory of social dynamics. In so far, however, as this definition is a rough-and-ready attempt to describe the general economic aim of the Socialist movement and the Socialist conception of the economic structure of what they believe will be the next

stage in the evolution of society, it may be accepted, provided only that we understand the loose sense in which the words "the means of production, distribution and exchange," are used. In certain cases jack-knives and spades are "means of production" and wheelbarrows and market-baskets are "means of distribution," but Socialists do not contemplate the socialization of spades and wheel-barrows. If they obtained complete control of the government in any state, or in the nation, it is ridiculous to suppose that they would want to institute the public ownership and control of jack-knives and market-baskets. To avoid captious criticism, therefore, it is admitted that Socialism does not involve the ownership of **all** means of production, distribution and exchange.

If it were not that the qualifying word would cause confusion to readers and hearers rather than prove en-

lightening and helpful, since it would convey no exact meaning to their minds, it would be better to say that Socialism involves the social ownership and control of the *principal* means of production, distribution and exchange. Many critics first set up a straw man which they call "Socialism" and then spend their time in gravely knocking it down. First they define Socialism as the destruction of all private property, and then proceed to attack the huge bureaucracy of their own creation. They point to the existence of hundreds of thousands of small farms and petty industries and demand to know if the State is going to confiscate these and manage them itself. Of course, the Socialists contemplate nothing of the kind.

It is inconceivable that the State will ever attempt to take away the artist's brushes, the small farmer's farm, or the tailor's needle and shears. These are all means of production, it

is true, but so are the housewife's sewing-machine, frying-pan, and a hundred other articles of daily use, the socialization of which would be impossible, and too absurd for anything but *opera bouffe* if it were possible. Tools and other necessities of production which are used by individual owners will, it is certain, never be taken away by the State. Only tools that are so complex as to require associated use, industries in which there is division of labor, and ownership of the necessary agencies of production by others than the producers, will ever be socialized. The only conceivable exceptions to this would be cases in which the safety and well-being of the community necessitated such a strict supervision of some individual's product as would only be possible under the state ownership of the necessary agents for its production. The possibility of any product of individual labor being so

vital to the life of the community and fulfilling these conditions is exceedingly remote.

Clothes, for example, are absolutely necessary to the inhabitant of these latitudes, though

“Down in Dahomey’s sunny land,
’Mid social functions on the sand,
A negro maid without a skirt
May thrive as bride, or belle, or flirt.”

Clothes, then, are necessities of life. In a large sense they are socially necessary, but they are peculiarly personal in their use, and properly the subject of private property. Social ownership of men’s pants and ladies’ shirt-waists is out of the question. Personal tastes, hygienic considerations, and the fact that they can be manufactured in any desired quantity, make the socialization of clothes an absurdity. Roads are quite as necessary to civilized man, socially and individually, as clothes. We must have roads of some sort, and good

roads are desirable just as good clothes are desirable. But roads cannot be multiplied indefinitely. Land is too valuable and too limited to allow every citizen to make his own roads. Besides that, it would be physically impossible to have every citizen make and own private roads to every place he desired to visit. The idea of nobody owning his own clothes and the idea of everybody owning his own roads are equally fantastic. Just as a hat or a pocket handkerchief is a good illustration of private property, being something which the owner can use personally, and without injury or inconvenience to others, so the public street is a good illustration of social ownership and control—of active Socialism. Roads are a common necessity, must be used in common, and are, therefore, made, maintained and owned in common. The humblest and poorest child has just as much right to use the streets of a

city, and just as big a share in them, as the wealthiest millionaire.

So much for the principles which distinguish private and social property. Now let us turn to the production of things. Shoes are today commonly made in great factories which turn out thousands—and in some cases millions—of pairs every year. The workers in these factories do not make all these shoes for themselves; they do not make them for the use of the owners of the factories. The shoes are made to supply the common demand for shoes from those who while they must wear shoes cannot make them for themselves. What interest, then, have the owners of the shoe factories in the manufacture of so many shoes? Simply the desire to make profit out of the social need. They employ so many workers to make shoes and pay them wages. Then they sell the shoes to whoever wishes to buy them at a price greatly

in excess of the cost of the materials used and the wages paid to the workers who made them. Neither the makers of shoes nor the buyers of shoes have any interest in maintaining the system which exploits their labor and their needs for others' profit. They might unite, therefore, and bring about the socialization of the shoe-making industry. But if there should be some fastidious person who did not care to wear factory-made shoes, and some shoemaker of the old school who preferred to make shoes by hand in the old-fashioned way, there could be no possible objection. The State would have no interest in taking away his tools.

Such instances of private production will probably always exist, but in general private production will not be able to withstand the competition of the machinery and subdivision of labor of factory production. On the one hand, the consumer will not be

willing to pay the cost of the slower, old-fashioned methods, and, on the other hand, the shoemaker will not be willing either to earn less or to work much harder and longer than his fellows employed in the socialized factories. Socialism does not involve the absorption of countless small farms and industries by the State. It involves the social ownership and control of only such property as is socially necessary, and of such agencies of production, distribution and exchange as are socially operated but exploited for private gain.

XIV.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PUBLIC OWNERSHIP TO SOCIALISM

We come now to a most interesting question, one that is already of considerable importance and will become more and more important as the Socialist movement in this country grows. With an increasing body of public ownership in our states and cities, brought about by non-Socialists, the question of its relation to Socialism naturally arises. At first thought it would seem that there could be no possible difference of opinion upon such a matter. If the Socialist state is to be based upon the collective ownership of all the principal means of production, distribution and exchange, must not the ownership of anything that is either a means of

production, of distribution, or of exchange be regarded as an unquestioned step toward that end, an installment of the Socialist programme?

That the non-Socialist advocates of public ownership should indignantly deny that proposals to make railroads, mines, telegraphs, banking, express service, and so on, state or national institutions are directly Socialistic is perfectly natural. They may not themselves be able to accept the full Socialist programme while believing entirely in the wisdom of socializing certain things; they may enter their denials to the charge of heading towards Socialism in the interest of the specific measures they advocate, knowing that a good deal of prejudice against Socialism exists. Their position is at least perfectly intelligible. The real difficulty arises when the Socialists themselves, instead of welcoming with the enthusiasm which might be expected every extension of

the principle of public ownership, and co-operating with every movement for the extension of the principle, as a step toward Socialism, oppose it actively or keep aloof from it and treat it with indifference.

Now it is very easy to impute narrow, selfish motives to the Socialists and the charge is being constantly made that only political jealousy, or bigotry, or intolerance, leads them to adopt this attitude. The slightest acquaintance with the Socialist movement, however, should be sufficient to discredit such an impeachment of its integrity and sincerity. It is simply unthinkable that a great movement which has been built up by such tremendous self-sacrifices as fill the pages of Socialist history should place the great principles and ideals which inspired those sacrifices beneath party or personal consideration. The unquestionable sincerity of the Socialists, and the intellectual attainments of

their leading exponents, may be taken as a sufficient guarantee that there are serious and important reasons, well worthy of careful and earnest consideration, for their attitude toward all non-Socialist movements aiming at public ownership of various public utilities. The subject is too complicated and too vast to be adequately dealt with in these pages, and what follows is merely a summary of some of the main reasons for the opposition of the Socialists to what seems to all other persons to be an advance in their direction.

There are certain fundamental principles by which the Socialist State must of necessity be characterized. (1) It must be politically democratic, all its citizens having equal political powers, without regard to sex, color, race, or creed; (2) all those things upon which the life of the people depends must be socially owned and used for the common good, instead of

for the profit of a class. It is quite evident, therefore, that Socialists must of necessity favor the extension of the suffrage until the requirements of political democracy have been fulfilled. In countries where the right to vote is a class privilege, denied to the workers, they may very properly concentrate all their energies upon the task of securing popular enfranchisement. In so concentrating their energies upon a political issue, and subordinating to it all other issues, they do not violate any of the logical or traditional principles of Socialist policy. On the other hand, though the political system might fall far short of their democratic ideal, say by the exclusion of women, for instance, the Socialists could with perfect consistency refuse to concentrate their activities upon that one issue. While heartily in favor of it, they might reasonably refuse to give special predominance to the enfranchisement of women, and

even condemn any attempt to do so under certain circumstances. Still, in general, they would support any proposal which might be made to extend the franchise to women, even though the proposal emanated from other than Socialist sources. If, however, it should be proposed to give political power to *some* women instead of to *all* women, say upon a basis of property or tax-paying qualification, the Socialists would vigorously oppose it. While it might be argued that the enfranchisement of some women would be a step toward the enfranchisement of all women, they could not let that consideration outweigh the fact that the proposal involved the extension of the anti-democratic principle of class privilege.

The same general arguments apply to the collective ownership of means of production, distribution or exchange. If some astute American statesman should successfully adopt

Bismarck's famous policy, and introduce government ownership of railways and so-called State Socialism, for purposes similar to those of Bismarck—the strengthening of militarism and the undermining of the Socialist movement—the Socialists could hardly be expected to support the policy, no matter how many people might be deceived by superficial likenesses, and the use of phrases and arguments speciously like those of the Socialist propaganda. Nothing in history is more common than the emasculation of great principles, either deliberately by cunning foes, or unconsciously by unwise friends.

Just as with Wordsworth's Peter Bell—

“A primrose on the river's brim,
A yellow primrose was to him”

and nothing more than that, so, to a great many persons, Socialism is public ownership and nothing more. Yet, it must be perfectly obvious, one

would think, that Russia with her state railways and state monopoly of the liquor traffic is at least no nearer being Socialistic than the United States. The same applies to Germany with her state railways, insurance, banking, and other institutions publicly owned instead of privately as in the United States. Externally similar, these examples of public ownership differ radically from the socialization advocated by Socialists. They bear the same relation to Socialism that a poor copy of a great painting bears to the original.

XV.

THE MISSING SPIRIT

What is it that is lacking in the public ownership with which we are familiar that it falls short of the Socialist aim? It is a spiritual quality, not a mechanical one. We must hark back for answer to the class motive. Socialism is essentially a movement of the working class and the interest of that class is its vital principle. That principle is almost entirely absent from the public ownership which exists within the capitalist state, or is proposed by defenders of the capitalist state. In the Bible story of the creation of man, God first made a form out of red earth, but it was not until He breathed into its nostrils the breath of life that the Thing became a living soul. The public ownership

evolved within the capitalist state is just a soulless form, it has not received the breath of life of Socialism, the spirit of the interest and inspiration of the working class.

Of late there has been much agitation upon the question of the municipal ownership of various public services. New political parties have arisen in various parts of the country, or old parties in new guise, with programmes of municipal ownership, and it is safe to predict that there will be a widespread movement for municipal ownership in the near future. The Socialists are called upon to unite with the advocates of municipal ownership, in order that Socialism may be reached a "step at a time." That they will refuse to do this is certain, and they are in duty bound to make plain the reasons for that refusal.

Socialists have always stood for municipal ownership. When those who now cry out for it were as vigor-

ously denouncing it, the Socialists were advocating and working for the municipalization of all public services. But they want municipal ownership in the interest of the working class. If it is proposed for the benefit of the capitalist class, either by giving them a still tighter clutch upon the throats of the workers through interest-bearing bonds, or through the reduction of their taxes, the Socialists feel that it should be resisted. The workers can best serve their class interests by voting for Socialism, which involves municipal ownership, since the Socialist proposal is to use the municipal ownership they advocate as a means of improving the conditions of life for the wealth producers, and, finally, as a step toward the complete overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of an Industrial Commonwealth. If they who so loudly cry out for municipal ownership want it in the interests of the workers, the despoiled and dis-

inherited victims of capitalist exploitation, they will work with the Socialist Party toward that end—they do not need new parties. If, on the contrary, they want it not in the interests of the workers but of the master-class, that is a full and sufficient reason why the workers should not support them. That, in a nutshell, is the Socialist argument.

Municipal ownership is not a new thing in history. In the Middle Ages the cities frequently carried on manufacture and commerce upon an extensive scale. Further back than that, more than two thousand years ago, Athens, in the time of Clisthenes, adopted the principle of municipal ownership and carried it a great deal further than our present day Reformers propose to carry it. Let us try for a moment in imagination to reconstruct the Athens of that period.

As the picture of the ancient city-state appears we get a vivid impres-

sion of its vast and far-reaching municipal genius. The citizens live in houses built and maintained by the city, their cattle is pastured outside the city upon the city's pastures. Much of the food they buy is produced on the city's farms, and the city saves them from extortionate demands by private traders by fixing the prices of all other foodstuffs. The money they use is minted in the municipal mint and bears the city's imprint. The fuel they burn is supplied by the city. They enjoy municipal baths, parks, gymnasia, art galleries, concert halls and theaters; they can even worship in the municipal churches. The city owns its own markets, wharves, ships and warehouses, and operates its own mines. Its tremendous revenues from these sources enables the city to assist its citizens in times of scarcity and high prices, to retail food at less than cost, and to give freely to those unable to

pay. Even so, its treasury overflows at times and the city government has to order a division of the surplus equally among the citizens.

From the Socialist viewpoint this is an alluring picture, but it has another side. The wonderful and comprehensive system of municipal ownership which Athens enjoyed was not Socialism any more than the municipal ownership advocated by our present day Reformers would be. It was all in the interests of a ruling class. All the benefits were enjoyed by the citizens, or freemen, of whom there were little more than twenty thousand, as against two hundred thousand slaves who were exploited for their benefit and enjoyment. The Socialist sees in this a significant lesson for the wage-workers of today. Athens had municipal ownership, but all the benefits were wrung from its slave class and enjoyed by its master class. And that is precisely what would result from

the system of municipal ownership proposed today by those who do not aim at the liberation of labor from the thralldom of the capitalist system. The proposal to municipalize any public service unless for the benefit of the workers and as a step toward the socialization of all the means of the common life, must, the Socialist believes, result in giving all the advantages to the comparatively small class of masters at the expense of the workers. Let us have municipal ownership, cries the Socialist, but not in the interest of the master class! Let us have municipal ownership in our own interest! Let us have a government of city, state and nation by the wealth producers for the wealth producers! Let us have Socialism!

Already, within the existing capitalist system, private enterprise has failed, and a system of public ownership has been evolved. Our postal system is a pertinent example. We are so

accustomed to regard public ownership as a new and untried thing that we are prone to forget that it already operates to a very large extent. In almost all our cities the water supply is municipally owned, in many cities the lighting of public thoroughfares has ceased to be a private business. The citizen of New York who desires to go to Staten Island may ride in a municipally owned ferryboat, and the citizen of Chicago can read his paper by the aid of the publicly owned electric lights. We have public schools, hospitals, dispensaries, libraries, museums, art galleries, parks, lodging houses, baths, and numerous other public conveniences, because private enterprise has failed in these directions. They do not satisfy the Socialist; they are but the forms waiting for the breath of life to be breathed into them; but they represent a significant phase of our social development, the failure of the essential prin-

ciple of capitalism. Some day, sooner or later, the Socialist spirit will be breathed into these and all other public institutions which capitalism evolves in its vain struggle for life and against self-extinction. Socialism triumphant will inherit a host of such forms from capitalism, and many of them will need only the vitalizing principle of democracy to make them truly Socialistic in spirit as well as in form. In that narrow sense only can the public ownership movement be described as "making for the Socialist goal."

XVI.

SOME OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED

In the foregoing pages the attempt has been made to give in plain, everyday language a concise explanation of the leading principles of the Socialist movement. Now let us consider, briefly, some of the more important objections to Socialism which commonly present themselves to the candid mind, and which are not elsewhere touched upon. It is impossible to consider trivial objections, or even all the important ones, in the brief space at our disposal, but there is no lack of literature devoted to that purpose.

I. It is urged that Socialism would lead to corruption and graft by making the spoils of political office much

greater than now. Graft, say these critics, flourishes now wherever elected bodies are entrusted with the control of large revenues, and to increase those revenues would be to place a premium upon corruption.

Those who urge this objection fail to understand correctly either the nature of graft or of Socialism. Graft certainly flourishes now in all business, both private and public. That we hear more about graft in public business and less about graft in private business is natural, and it is, moreover, an encouraging fact, for it points to the preventative and curative value of a widespread public interest and criticism. By the very nature of the business, graft in public business is always more easily detected, and therefore more easily ended, than in private business. That is an important point which is often lost sight of.

Another point that is not generally

recognized is that graft in public business is almost invariably in the interest of some private business. Take, for instance, the postoffice; what is the nature of the graft in this important public service? Mr. Henry A. Castle, a former auditor for the postoffice department, in an article* upon the deficit in that department, says:

"In the United States last year (1904) the enormous sum of \$46,000,000 was paid the railroads for transportation of the mails, of which sum \$5,000,000 represented that inexcusable and scandalous graft, the rent of mail cars, under which item more is paid annually for the bare use of the cars than the cars cost in the first place."

The *Detroit Journal* has shown that with the elimination of this and similar forms of graft the postal department would have had a surplus of \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 instead of a

*In Harper's Weekly.

deficit of more than \$14,000,000. It is clear, therefore, that the graft which fastens itself upon the post office department, about which so much has been written, is an evil arising out of predatory private business and not of public ownership. The remedy for the evil lies, not in making a private business of the postal service, but in extending the principle of public ownership to the railroads. Graft then would probably center in the business of supplying the publicly owned railroads with coal, rails, and other necessities, and the remedy again would be in the destruction of that predatory private business and the further extension of public ownership and control.

The objection that it would lead to graft applies to public ownership only when it is limited, static, and dependent upon private business for some essential thing. In general, the objection applies to that kind of public

ownership which is advocated by Reformers instead of Socialism. It does not apply to Socialism, which is not static but progressive and in no sense dependent upon private business. Socialism implies (a) Widespread public interest and criticism, fatal to graft, (b) the overthrow of that class interest which produces graft, (c) the end of that private business which flourishes parasitically through the medium of graft and the plunder of public treasuries.

II. It is feared by some that Socialism will destroy individuality and reduce all men to a dull level of mediocre equality. This objection rests primarily upon the following grounds: First, it is believed that Socialism would destroy the greatest incentive man has, the desire for personal gain; and second, that Socialism must inevitably take the form of a huge bureaucracy, governing everything from a central point, and imposing a

rigid uniformity upon the life of its citizens.

Now, if Socialism involves the destruction of individuality it is manifestly undesirable; a thing to be avoided as long as possible, and to be accepted only as a necessary evil should it prove to be inevitable. Let us briefly consider the objection in the light of this agreement. In the first place, it is worthy of note that the Socialist is as a rule a man of marked individuality. It takes a man of some individuality to ally himself with an unpopular movement involving, as the Socialist movement still does, a certain amount of social ostracism. If we take a list of the leaders of Socialist thought and activity and compare it with any similar list of leaders of thought in any other sphere, we shall not find the Socialists lacking in individuality. Marx, the philosopher and economist; Lassalle, Liebknecht and Bebel, the political leaders; Ferri,

the scientist; Morris, the poet and artist,—where shall we find a group of men of more pronounced individuality than these? Strange indeed would it be if such men should give their aid to any movement calculated to destroy the opportunities for individual development and expression.

For a more direct argument, let us ask ourselves whether there is anything to justify the fear that the principle of public ownership is incompatible with individuality on the part of those who share its benefits and responsibilities. Is there anything in history to warrant such a belief? For answer, let us turn back again to that page of Athenian history over which we have already pondered. Mr. W. D. P. Bliss has gathered together a list of the great Athenians whose names loom large in history's pages, all of them names of men who lived between the years 490 B. C. and 338 B. C., a period of 150 years during

which public ownership flourished. Says Mr. Bliss:

"What a record it is! Socrates (469—399 B.C.), Plato (428—347 B.C.), Aristotle (384—322 B.C.); surely in the history of thought there are no greater names than these. In the drama, Æschylus (525—456 B.C.), Sophocles (495—406 B.C.), Euripides (480—406 B.C.)—here are the masters of the classic tragedy; while Aristophanes (444—380 B.C.) is the unique founder of the world's comedy. In history, Thucydides (470—404 B.C.) has perhaps no rival, while Xenophon (430—355 B.C.) has but few. In sculpture, Phidias (490—432 B.C.) and Praxiteles (390 B.C.) stand supreme, while Myron (480 B.C.) and Scopas (370 B.C.) occupy high place. In architecture, Ictinus and Callicrates, the architects of the Parthenon (438 B.C.), and Mnesicles, the builder of the Propylæa (437 B.C.), produced works, of their period certainly the most beautiful, and of all periods the most perfect buildings in the world. In painting, Polygnotus (460 B.C.) did work which cultured Athens placed on a par with her sculpture. In oratory, every school-boy knows of Demosthenes (385—322 B.C.), every college boy of Æschines (389—314 B.C.); while their contemporaries compared Lysias (445—378 B.C.) and Isocrates (436—338 B.C.) with these. In statesmanship, Pericles (495—429 B.C.), Cimon (504—449 B.C.), and Themistocles (514—449 B.C.) are names that would stand out in any history;

while in generalship, Miltiades (490 B.C.), the hero of Marathon, and Nicias, the leader in the Spartan wars, can never be forgotten. Other names, among them Alcibiades (450—404 B.C.), Cleon (422 B.C.), Thrasybulus (390 B.C.), Lycurgus, the orator (395—323 B.C.), and Myronides (457 B. C.), belong to this period. Thirty one names! Where in history is there another city that can produce even an approximation to such a record?***

In modern times we have no such far-reaching system of public ownership to which we can turn. Taking such examples of the principle as we have, however, does anybody contend for a single moment that since the State has undertaken so many public services there is less individuality in consequence? Is there less individuality today, in any real sense, than there was in the days of privately controlled roads and toll-gates? Have we less individuality than our grandfathers had because of our public schools, libraries, art galleries, museums, baths, parks, and the like? Is

*From The Outlook, Nov. 11, 1905.

our individuality lessened because we drink municipally supplied water, and depend upon municipal fire-fighting forces to protect us from fire? Is any man robbed of his individual freedom because he pays only two cents to send a letter from Maine to California and the same amount to send a letter to an address in the next street? No man is compelled to use any municipal or state service if he can possibly do without it, or if he finds it more profitable to do so. If any citizen should prefer to send his letters by private messenger, the government would not try to stop him. All that the government does is to provide a letter-carrying service upon a plan infinitely more economical than any which private enterprise could possibly devise. It does not attempt to compel any person to use that service. If the municipality provides us with water it does not interfere with our personal liberties any

more than the private corporation which supplies our gas does. That frightful bugbear of so many timorous souls, the great bureaucracy which they fear extensive public ownership would involve, has no justification in fact.

The question of incentive is one that merits serious consideration. If it is true that Socialism would destroy the only incentive, or the main incentive, to progress, the chief motor impelling mankind onward, then it is undesirable. But are we sure as to the facts? Is it true that love of gain is the great incentive of progress it is supposed to be? The early Christian fathers held a very different view. They believed and taught that it was the root of all the evil in the world. Which view is right? That love of gain, or, to name it plainly, greed, is responsible for a vast amount of crime is unquestionable. It causes wars, murders, thefts, and countless other

crimes: as an incentive to evil and wrongdoing its influence can hardly be overestimated. If we reckon all the evils of the world, all the crimes and ill deeds which stain and besmirch history's pages, it appears as the most important cause. Greed is, and ever has been, a prolific producer of deeds of shame.

When, however, we turn to the brighter, nobler pages of history; to the deeds that glow with splendor and thrill our souls with glory and enthusiasm, we do not find greed present as the inspiring cause. We pause before a great picture with feelings akin to reverence, knowing that something nobler and greater than mere love of gain filled the artist's soul and guided his brush. Moved by some great poem, we know that it must have been inspired by something else than the hope of personal gain. Greed may inspire a United States Senator to graft and fraud, but some-

thing else inspired William Lloyd Garrison, whose memory is being honored while these pages are being written. Greed may inspire a minister of the poor Christ of Nazareth to compromise the gospel of his Master with Mammon's, but it was not greed which led the saintly Father Damien forth to his noble mission. Greed may have been powerful enough to inspire the slave-hunter, but it was some nobler passion which inspired John Brown. Greed, the lure of thirty pieces of silver, inspired Judas, but it was not greed which inspired Jesus to endure the agonies of Gethsemane and Golgotha.

The love of gain never produced a great picture, a great poem, or a great play or opera; it never won a great battle, it is probably safe to say that it never led to a great invention or discovery. For love of art men have painted great pictures, and written books and poems, that made their

names immortal; for love of science men have made discoveries which revolutionized the thought of the world; for love of battle men have performed deeds of heroism celebrated in song and story. For love of fame, the desire to win the applause of their fellows, all these things have been done; and they have been done for love of country, or love of a great cause. Milton, it is said, received only \$40 for writing *Paradise Lost*. Whether he wrote because he loved his art or because he yearned for fame, may not be known, but it is certain that he did not write for love of money. If love of money is the great inspirer, why is it that the far greater prizes of the modern literary world do not produce more Miltons and Shakespeares? Karl Marx, recognized all over the world now as one of the greatest thinkers of his age, turned away contemptuously from the offer of comparative wealth made

by Bismarck to write "Das Kapital" while he toiled and starved in London.

A year or two ago, a great surgeon came to this country from Vienna. He came, it was understood, to perform an operation upon a little girl, the daughter of one of our multimillionaires. While he was in the country he performed many other operations, some of them upon little children whose parents were too poor to pay him anything at all, yet nobody believes that he tried less earnestly to help his poorest patients than to help the child of the multimillionaire. A few years ago, a great German physician and teacher of physicians made an important discovery with regard to the nature of that awful scourge of our race, tuberculosis, a discovery which has revolutionized the method of its treatment by the medical profession. The name of Dr. Koch is today universally honored as that of a great benefactor to the race. But

suppose that Dr. Koch had made a secret of his discovery, or demanded a big price for it, commensurate with what he felt to be its value, would he not have been execrated and regarded as a moral monster? Had that other great physician, Professor von Behring, demanded a big price for the secret of his anti-toxin for diphtheria, or should he do so in the event of his discovering a similar method of treating tuberculosis, he, too, would be universally execrated. Yet, that is precisely what we ought to expect them to do, according to this theory that love of gain is the great incentive and motor force of progress.

No, greed is the main incentive to crime and wrongdoing, but other incentives move men and women to the nobler deeds that make for progress, for sweetness and light in the world. These incentives, love of art, of knowledge, of fame, of country, of mankind, will not be stamped out by

Socialism: on the contrary, they may be expected to flourish the more when they are not retarded and held in check by the poisoned atmosphere of commercialism. Socialism does not involve the equal reward of all men, regardless of the quality of their service. It will give every man an opportunity to earn the necessities of life without degradation or undue discomfort; beyond that it will hold out rewards for services of distinction, for brave deeds, great discoveries and inventions, which men will strive after more earnestly than they could strive for gold.

III. Socialism is often opposed because of a supposed connection between it and anarchism. Nothing is more common, especially in times of national agitation consequent upon some outrageous deed, such as the assassination of President McKinley, for example, than this confusion of the two theories one with another. Yet

the fact remains that the organized Socialist movement is the greatest opposing force to Anarchism in the world today. Socialism is the anti-thesis of Anarchism; the two are quite irreconcilable. To save society from the Anarchist peril is no small part of the mission of the Socialist movement.

In justice to the Anarchists it must be said that there is nothing in Anarchism itself which necessitates a propaganda of deeds of violence. While it is true that many Anarchists have resorted to violence, there are many others, and among them some of the greatest leaders of Anarchist thought, who hold all life sacred and believe that violence and assassination, like war and conquest, are fundamentally opposed to the Anarchist ideal. So much must be said in justice to the Anarchists.

Now, if we examine the two systems of thought, we shall find that Socialism and Anarchism are as op-

posite as the poles. While there may be many points of similarity in their criticisms of existing social conditions, the Socialist and the Anarchist are separated by a wide, impassable gulf. Socialism, as the word implies, is based on the idea of social interest and responsibility, while Anarchism is based on the opposite idea of individual interest and responsibility. Anarchism negatives the idea of social responsibility. It regards the individual as supreme. Society, according to the Anarchist, is merely an aggregation of individuals, from which principle he reasons that what is wrong for an individual is wrong for society, and, since no individual can rightly control the actions of another, society cannot rightly do so. To this the Socialist replies that just as a watch is something more than a collection of wheels, or a house is more than an aggregation of bricks and mortar, so society is something more than an aggregation

of individuals; it is a corporate whole with distinct rights and duties.

The difference in Anarchism and Socialism, therefore, consists in this, and not, as is often supposed, in the fact that the Socialists do not believe in physical force as the Anarchists are popularly supposed to do. It is not a question of Socialism being a milder, less advanced, and less dangerous form of the same ideas as Anarchism. The two theories have no relationship whatever. It is not a difference of method, but of ultimate aim. Not all Anarchists, nor most of them, believe in physical force methods, and Socialists, while abhorring the very idea of bloodshed, would, under certain conditions, have to resort to it. Where political power, or other peaceable means are denied to a people "rightly struggling to be free," force is permissible and right. Of such rebellious uses of force, indeed, have the most glorious pages

of history been written. From such a rising rose this great republic itself. But where other, peaceful means are open to them, the Socialists will never choose violence, regarding force not as the "Midwife of Progress," but as "The deadly abortionist strangling the new society in the womb of the old."

The Socialist seeks to establish social paramountcy through legislative action. And this social paramountcy is but an extension of the same active principle which we find expressed in our sanitary laws, our educational system, and other similar manifestations of the collective will and law. From the point of view of the Anarchist, who, after all, merely carries individualism to its logical extreme, sanitary laws, education acts, factory acts, and all other such social legislation, are so many "outrageous interferences" with individual liberty. All legislation is equally condemned. As the Prohibitionist would scorn the classification of

whiskey as good or bad, declaring that all whiskey is bad and there cannot be such a thing as "good whiskey," so the Anarchist denies that there can be such a thing as "good legislation."

When we say that Socialism seeks to establish the interests of society as paramount, it is not meant by that that Socialism is opposed to the individual liberty which the Anarchists desire; that it involves a huge, octopus-like bureaucracy governing all men's actions, crushing out all individuality, and placing all the relations of life under a vast network of laws and regulations. The Socialist ideal is not, as its enemies would have us believe, law backed by a policeman. It does not propose to encompass life with legal enactments and restrictions. On the contrary, its aim is to secure to every individual the greatest possible freedom. Social control in the Socialist regime would be reduced to the minimum necessary to protect the equal

liberties of all; it would take the form of a protection of the essentials of personal freedom by denying the right of any man to be master of another's bread. Personal liberty is only possible as the blossoming of common liberty.

The conflict between Socialism and Anarchism is, therefore, susceptible of no truce. The history of the Socialist movement is in large part the history of a struggle with Anarchism. The result is seen today in the fact that wherever Socialism is strong, as in Germany, for example, Anarchism is a negligible force, and wherever, as in Spain, Socialism is weak, Anarchism prevails. Socialism is not only the greatest force in the world opposed to Anarchism, it is the only remedy for the conditions which makes Anarchists. To sweep away the hideous anomaly of extreme misery side by side with wanton extravagance and colossal wealth is the only effectual means

of staying the perilous tide of Anarchism. Neither repressive measures nor tinkering with the immigration laws will accomplish that end, which is part of the purpose and mission of Socialism.

IV. Socialism is opposed by some because it is believed to be antagonistic to religion and to the institution of marriage. These objections are thus coupled because they are commonly associated in a certain form of attack on Socialism. The usual method is to present a long string of quotations from Socialists of more or less prominence in which anti-religious views are expressed. Often these quotations are so garbled or dishonestly torn from their contexts as to misrepresent the views of their authors. This despicable and dishonest method of attack has been resorted to by a section of the "religious" press for many years. The method is just as dishonest and mean as that of the in-

fidel lecturer who said that Christ was an advocate of suicide, and, to prove his case, read the two passages, "And he (Judas) went away and hanged himself" (Matthew 27:5) and "Go and do thou likewise" (Luke 10:37), as one passage!

Robert Ingersoll, the great free-thinker, was a Republican. Suppose that some Socialist should take the trouble of compiling a list of quotations from his writings, and the writings of other noted freethinkers who have been Republicans, would it be fair to argue from that list that the Republican party is opposed to religion? Would it be fair to compile such a list from the writings of Jefferson and other Democrats who have been agnostics and free thinkers, and by means of it seek to brand the Democratic party as an anti-religious party? Would it not be equally possible to compile a list of Catholics, or of Spiritualists, belonging to either party,

and from it to argue that the party is a Catholic or Spiritualist party? Such cowardly and dishonest methods of attack are unworthy of serious consideration.

But many people have honestly opposed Socialism because they have believed it to be anti-religious. They have made the not unnatural mistake of confusing the Socialist theory of the economic interpretation of history, sometimes called the "materialistic conception" of history, with philosophic materialism as opposed to theism. They have concluded that Socialism must be based upon a theory fundamentally opposed to the religious view of the great primary First Cause. Once it is understood, however, that this is not the case; that historic materialism is not a theory relating to the primary cause of the cosmic process, this argument loses its weight. Theist and atheist, monist, agnostic and materialist, may each ac-

cept the Socialist theory of historic materialism without doing violence to religious beliefs or doubts.

True, the atheist may not be able to see how it is possible for the theist to reconcile his theism with historic materialism; and the theist may be unable to understand the process of reasoning by which the atheist finds in historic materialism an argument for his views of the universe which he deems unanswerable. Just as when the Darwinian theory was first propounded many people said that it was atheistic, while good Christians on the other hand accepted it, so it has been with Socialism. Today the Socialist movement is made up of men and women of all shades of religious belief and doubt; adherents of all the sects and creeds which have arisen in the development of religious thought and life. All the Socialist parties of the world declare religion to be a matter of private judgment and conscience.

The last objection with which we shall deal in these pages is that Socialism is opposed to the institution of marriage and to the family tie. This objection is generally put forward in the same manner and spirit as the one concerning religion. Because certain individual Socialists have also entertained theories affecting the marriage relation, unscrupulous opponents of Socialism have used that as an argument against Socialism, quite regardless of the fact that the great mass of Socialists never entertained such views; and the further fact that the anti-marriage, "free love" theories in question have been even more frequently and vigorously advocated by non-Socialists. Every time an account appears in the press of marital infelicity among Socialists the event is hailed as another "proof" that "Socialism will destroy the family and the home," notwithstanding that the causes of the trouble may be entirely

disassociated from Socialism, and that there are millions of Socialist homes in which love reigns supreme.

Once again, the question arises, if such arguments may be used against Socialists, why may they not be used by Socialists against their opponents? If some one should compile a list of, say, a thousand divorces, the parties to which were all Christians of more or less prominence, would it justify the conclusion that Christianity is an attack on the marriage relation and on the family? Could the same rule be applied to Republicans and Democrats? This is, of course, the *reductio ad absurdum* of the methods of attack adopted by the opponents of Socialism.

So far as Socialism will affect the conjugal relations at all, it may be safely predicted that it will tend to preserve and strengthen them. By securing to women their economic independence, a blow would be struck at the

hideous commercialization of marriage so common at present. Tens of thousands of women, afraid to encounter the cruel struggle for existence, marry for homes and security of a livelihood without the sanction of love, the only sanction for the marriage relation. The records of our divorce courts abound with instances of matrimonial failure due to this cause. As Professor Richard T. Ely says: "The causes for divorce have been shown by the National Department of Labor to be largely economic, it is the pressure of economic wants in the lower middle class which is most fruitful of divorce."* Lower still in the social scale, the problem of the desertion of wives and families appears. Investigations of this problem by Charity Organization Societies, bodies not prone to exaggerating economic causes, have, without exception, shown economic causes, such as low wages and unemployment, to be prime causes of this evil of wife desertion.

*Political Economy, p. 261.

Socialism would remove these causes.

Finally, there is the great evil of prostitution, due also in very large measure to environmental and economic causes which Socialism would remove. The moral perils attendant upon child labor; low wages which make decent marriages impossible for thousands of men and women, and the resultant creation of "she towns" on the one hand and "he towns" on the other; the low wages paid to working girls and women, and the conditions of employment so vividly described in that impressive book, *The Long Day*, are all important factors in the creation of the Social Evil. It is not claimed that Socialism will perfect human nature so that under it marital troubles and sexual vices will disappear, but it is confidently claimed that Socialism will remove some of the most fruitful causes of these evils. Socialism comes as the Emancipator of Woman and the Protector of the Home.

XVII.

CONCLUSION

The sole aim of the writer of this little volume has been to present the claims of Socialism candidly and in simple language. If it serves to help its readers to a clearer understanding of the aims of the Socialist movement its purpose will have been abundantly served and its existence justified. There are many important subjects which have been only briefly touched upon in these pages for a fuller treatment of which the reader is referred to the many excellent books devoted to them, a brief list of which will be found at the end of this volume. In conclusion, it may be well to answer briefly the question

which must present itself to the mind of every one who feels the justice and reasonableness of the Socialist position, "What can I do to help onward the great movement?"

Many years ago, the good quaker poet, John Greenleaf Whittier, advised the young men of his day to "seek for some just and despised cause and attach themselves to it." Today we call upon all men and women, young and old alike, who believe that the Socialist cause is just, to attach themselves to it. By voting for Socialism if they have votes, by urging others to vote for it if they have no votes themselves; by carefully studying its literature and equipping themselves to plead its cause successfully, either in private or in public, and to defend it whenever the need arises, it is possible for every man and woman who believes in Socialism to identify himself or herself with it. That is the minimum of service to be expected from the earnest

man or woman who believes that the Socialist cause is just and true.

A still greater service is possible by joining the Socialist Party, the organized effort of thousands of devoted men and women of all races and creeds to develop the Socialist movement in America along intelligent lines. The Socialist Party exists primarily for the purpose of making Socialists. By carefully organized propaganda it is possible for people to accomplish much more in the way of creating Socialist sentiment than the same people could accomplish by acting individually. Not only so, but by having a well organized political party to carry on political campaigns it is rendered possible to keep the Socialist cause from being trailed in the dirt by freaks on the one hand, or by charlatans on the other. Organized in every state and territory, the Socialist Party is open to every man or woman desiring to join it, provided that they renounce all connec-

tion with any and every other political party, and accept the principles set forth in the Socialist Party Platform and the rules of the Socialist Party.

The Socialist Party differs in many important respects from every other political party. In the first place, all its members pay "dues," a small monthly sum, for the support of the party. This unusual practice is observed for the reason that it is a working-class party; it is the safeguard of the party against corruption and betrayal. The other great political parties have no such system. They get their funds, as the current insurance investigations in New York have shown, through grafting upon great corporations. In reality these great corporate interests buy up the political parties and, because they own them, control them in all essential particulars. The Socialist Party does not get its funds that way, but from the monthly payments of its members, and their

voluntary contributions. It is the only party in the country which publishes regularly a full account of all its expenditures, including its campaign funds. The Socialist Party is not run by "bosses," either good or bad, but by its members, the rank and file. Every member has an equal voice and vote in the management of the party's affairs and the organization is the most democratic possible.

If, reader, you feel it to be your duty to unite with this great movement for the freedom of the working-class from its present thralldom and bondage, join the Socialist Party in your locality. If you do not know the address of the nearest branch, write to the National Secretary of the party for information. If there is a local organization of the party in your neighborhood he will give you the address. If there is none, he will tell you how to become a "member-at-large" of the party, and, better still, how to form a local organization.

"Come, then, since all things call us, the living
and the dead,

And o'er the weltering tangle a glimmering light
is shed.

Come, then, let us cast off fooling, and put by
ease and rest,

For the Cause alone is worthy till the good days
bring the rest.

Come, join in the only battle wherein no man can
fail,

Where whoso fadeth and dieth, yet his deed shall
still prevail.

Ah! come, cast off all fooling, for this at least we
know:

That the Dawn and the Day is coming, and forth
the Banners go."

APPENDICES.

I.

A DREAM WHICH MUST COME TRUE.

A profound faith in the ultimate realization of human brotherhood and comradeship is implied by the very name we Social-Democrats* bear. Good old Bronterre O'Brien, who in the rich mint of his powerful mind coined the phrase we now so proudly write for name upon our banners, sounded the very depths of our philosophy and scaled the heights of our faith when he declared, more than sixty years ago, that Brotherhood could never be realized in the world until Liberty reigned in the world; and that Liberty could never reign in the world until the system permitting private ownership of socially necessary things **is destroyed**.

So when we today declare for the social ownership of all socially necessary things; when we denounce the system which makes private property master of the common life; when we urge our demands that the means of the common life, produced as they are by the common labor and experience of the world, be owned in com-

*In Europe the Socialists are most often called Social Democrats—That is, Socialists who believe in Democratic Socialism as opposed to State Socialism.

mon, we are more than a mere political party aiming at political supremacy.

We are the apostles of the great universal religious impulse, the faith of Humanity that the Brotherhood of Man shall yet be universally recognized.

Thus we proclaim our faith in the highways and the byways of the world and sing it in our song. We are the heralds of the Golden Age of Peace. "The day is coming," we cry, "when the cannon's roar will be silenced by the Peace-Song of a free and gladsome world. The day is coming, its dawning is at hand, when Socialism triumphant will break down the last barrier that keeps a single child from the fullest enjoyment of the vast heritage prepared for it through long centuries of pain and toil. The day is at hand when there shall be no man master of another's bread and life; when the words "master" and "slave" and all their hypocritical latter-day equivalents shall pass from human speech and memory. The day is nearer than most of us think or know when the ghoulisn coining of little child lives into dividends shall cease and the tender babes be given their natural fellowship with bird and flower."

"Dreams! Dreams! Only dreams!" you say. Yes, we are dreamers and this is our great and glorious dream. But before you sneer at the dreamers or the dream, look at the great army of dreamers.

Yonder peasant on Russian steppe, bowed with

oppressing toil, dreams that dream, sees that vision of a redeemed and revived world, and the load of his life is lightened. And that poor mother in Siberian exile, torn from the home where she was the love-crowned queen, could not bear the anguish of her lone exile but for the same vision.

In German workshop and garrison tired workers and pallid prisoners dream the same dream and their faces are lit by the same hope-light.

From the vineyards of France and from her cities comes sound of glad songs: They are singing of the same hope. And Italy and Spain join in the strain.

From England's industrial hells and from the abysses of her great cities, those frightful dens of misery and squalor, a shout of increasing volume tells that they have seen the same vision and dreamed the same dream as that which inspires the workers of our own land from the crowded tenements of New York to the crowded tenements of San Francisco; on the small New England farm and the great prairie wheat farm; in the coal mines that lie in the heart of the Alleghenies, and the metaliferous mines of the Rockies.

In far off Australia tens of thousands of toilers, gathered from all climes and speaking all tongues, find inspiration in the same dream. It is life itself to them. And where Africa's millions gather in mine or factory, upon the cities' streets or the great karoo, the dream unites

Boer and Briton, Kaffir and White in one strong brotherhood.

And even 'mid the battle's din where Russ slave and Jap slave fight till their blood mingles in one red stream at the bidding of their masters, the vision appears and hatred, ignorant, blind hatred, is banished from many a heart.

How vast the army of dreamers!

Time was when only the lone prophet in Israel dreamed such a dream or saw such a vision. He saw through the centuries the time to be "when the swords shall be beaten into plowshares and the spears into pruning hooks." He told of his vision, but men derided and cried out, "Dreamer of vain dreams!" The number of the prophets grew but slowly. The lonely Nazarene, homeless and poor; Campanella the Italian monk; Sir Thomas More, Saint Simon and Fourier, Robert Owen and the brave German tailor, Wilhelm Weitling. So the line of the "dreamers" grew and spanned the centuries.

But not till the clarion call of the great twin spirits, Marx and Engels, called upon the workers of the world to unite did we realize that the power to make the vision real rested entirely with ourselves.

Now how the army of dreamers has grown! And how it grows! It is no longer the dream of the lone prophet or the poet. It is the dream now of millions in all lands, of all creeds, of all tongues. It is the dream of *nations* now. And as Lowell truly sings: "*The dreams that nations dream come true!*"

Aye, such dreams "come true." No power can prevent the fulfillment of the dream of the world's brain and heart. Our red flag, symbolizing as it does our world-kinship and fraternity and the seas of martyr blood shed for the cause, shall yet float in triumph from every state capitol in the land.

Aye, and from the Capitol at Washington it shall proudly fly—to be answered from across seas by like emblems of the Socialist triumph of our comrades in Europe and Asia, Africa and Australasia.

"Softly sweet as living springs
Mighty hopes are blowing wide:
Passionate prefigurings
Of a world revived,
Dawning thoughts that ere they set
Shall possess the Ages yet!"

II.

A SUGGESTED COURSE OF READING FOR STUDENTS OF SOCIALISM.

In the foregoing pages an attempt has been made to state briefly, in popular language, the leading principles of Scientific Socialism. Much has been barely touched upon, and much else left unmentioned. It has been thought best, therefore, to include this suggested course of study, in the form of a list of books easily accessible, and requiring no special training on the part of the reader, for those who after reading this little volume may desire to study the subject

more thoroughly. No attempt is made to provide a bibliography of Socialism, but a brief list of useful works upon various aspects of Socialism.

(A) History of Socialism.

The History of Socialism, by Thomas Kirkup. (The Macmillan Co., \$1.50.)

French and German Socialism in Modern Times, by Richard T. Ely. (Harper Brothers, 75 cents.)

Socialism: Its Growth and Outcome, by William Morris and E. Belfort Bax. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., \$1.25.)

German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle, by W. H. Dawson. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., \$1.00.)

Ferdinand Lassalle as a Social Reformer, by Eduard Bernstein. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., \$1.00.)

The History of Socialism in the United States, by Morris Hillquit. (Funk & Wagnalls Co., \$1.75.)

The article on "Socialism" in the New International Encyclopedia, by Prof. R. T. Ely, is worthy of special attention.

(B) Philosophy of Socialism.

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific, by Friederich Engels. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., cloth 50 cents, paper 10 cents.)

The Quintessence of Socialism, by Prof. A. E. Schaffle. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., \$1.00.) This

is a fair and lucid statement of Socialism by an opponent.

Socialism and Modern Science, by Enrico Ferri. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., \$1.00.)

The Economic Interpretation of History, by Prof. E. R. A. Seligman. (The Macmillan Co., \$1.25.)

Mass and Class, by W. J. Ghent. (The Macmillan Co., cloth \$1.25, paper 25 cents.)

The World's Revolutions, by Ernest Untermann. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 50 cents.)

(C) *Economics of Socialism.*

Wage Labor and Capital, by Karl Marx. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 5 cents.)

Value, Price and Profit, by Karl Marx. (New York Labor News Co., 50 cents.)

The Economics of Socialism, by Henry M. Hyndman. (London: The Twentieth Century Press, \$1.00.)

Principles of Scientific Socialism, by Chas. H. Vail. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., \$1.00.)

(D) *The Trust Problem.*

Collectivism, by Emile Vandervelde. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 50 cents.)

The Evolution of Modern Capitalism, by John A. Hobson.

Monopolies and Trusts and Studies in the Evolution of Industrial Society, by Richard T. Ely. (The Macmillan Co., each \$1.25. These volumes are very suggestive and useful, though not definitely Socialist in aim or conception.

The American Farmer, by A. M. Simons. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 50 cents.) Deals with concentration in agriculture; a most suggestive and important little work.

(E) *Other Subjects.*

(1) *Anarchism: Socialism and Anarchism*, by George Plechanoff. (London: The Twentieth Century Press, 25 cents.)

Anarchism, its History and Theory, by E. V. Zenker. (G. P. Putnam's Sons, \$1.50.) A critique of Anarchism from a bourgeois viewpoint, but suggestive.

(2) *Poverty: American Pauperism*, by Isador Ladoff. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 50 cents.)

Poverty, by Robert Hunter. (The Macmillan Co., \$1.50 and 25 cents.)

The Bitter Cry of the Children, by John Spargo. (The Macmillan Co., \$1.50.) Deals with poverty in its relation to children.

(3) *Application of Socialist Principles: Socialists in French Municipalities*, compiled by Ernest Untermann. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 5 cents.)

Underfed School Children: The Problem and the Remedy, by John Spargo. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 10 cents.)

What the Socialists Would Do if Elected in This City, by A. M. Simons. (Chas. H. Kerr & Co., 5 cents.)

[It should be observed that Charles H. Kerr and Company do **NOT** fill orders for books issued by other publishers.]

Charles H. Kerr & Company's Books

ARRANGED BY TITLES

Descriptive Catalogue Free on Request

After Capitalism, What? By William Thurston Brown. Paper	\$0.05
American Communities and Co-operative Colonies. By William Alfred Hinds. Cloth,	1.50
American Esperanto Book. By Arthur Baker. Cloth	1.00
American Farmer, The. By A. M. Simons. Cloth50
American Pauperism and the Abolition of Poverty. By Isador Ladoff. Cloth.50
Anarchism and Socialism. By George Plechanoff. Cloth.50
Ancient Lowly, The. Vol I. By C. Osborne Ward. Cloth	2.00
Ancient Lowly, The. Vol. II. By C. Osborne Ward. Cloth	2.00
Ancient Society. By Lewis H. Morgan. Cloth,	1.50
Appeal to the Young, An. By Peter Kropotkin. Paper05
Art of Lecturing, The. Arthur M. Lewis. Paper25
Axe at the Root, The. Rev. William Thurston Brown. Paper05
Beyond the Black Ocean. By Rev. T. McGrady. Cloth	1.00
Paper50
Better-World Philosophy. By J. Howard Moore. Cloth	1.00
Britain for the British. By Robert Blatchford. Cloth50
Capital, a Critique of Political Economy. By Karl Marx. Complete in three volumes.	
I. The Process of Capitalist Production. Cloth	2.00
II. The Process of Circulation of Capital. Cloth	2.00
III. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole. Cloth	2.00
Capital and Labor. By a Blacklisted Machinist. Paper25
Capitalist and Laborer. By John Spargo. Cloth50

Changes in the Theory and Tactics of the (German) Social-Democracy. By Paul Kampffmeyer. Cloth50
Changing Order, The. By Oscar Lovell Triggs, Ph. D. Cloth	1.00
Civic Evils; or, The Relation of Money to Social Ethics. By Dr .C. H. Reed. Paper,05
Class Struggles in America. By A. M. Simons. Cloth50
Paper10
Collectivism and Industriam Evolution. By Emile Vandervelde. Cloth50
Common Sense of Socialism, The. By John Spargo. Cloth, \$1.00; paper25
Confessions of a Drone. By Joseph Medill Patterson. Paper05
Crime and Criminals. By Clarence Darrow. Paper10
Easy Lessons in Socialism. By William H. Leffingwell. Paper05
Economic Evolution. By Paul Lafargue. Paper05
Economic Foundation of Art, The. By A. M. Simons. Paper05
Economic Foundations of Society. By Achille Loria. Cloth	1.25
Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. By Karl Marx. Paper25
End of the World, The. Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer. Cloth50
Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History. By Antonio Labriola. Cloth	1.00
Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History. By Karl Kautsky. Cloth50
Evolution of Man, The. By Wilhelm Boelsche. Cloth50
Evolution of the Class Struggle, The. By William H. Noyes. Paper05
Evolution, Social and Organic. By Arthur M. Lewis. Cloth50
Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels. Cloth50
Folly of Being "Good," The. By Charles H. Kerr. Paper05
Forces That Make for Socialism in America. By John Spargo. Paper05
From Revolution to Revolution. By George D. Herron. Paper05
Germes of Mind in Plants. By R. H. France. Cloth50
God and My Neighbor. By Robert Blatchford. Cloth	1.00

God's Children. By James Allman. Cloth....	.50
Goethe's Faust, a Fragment of Socialist Criticism. By Marcus Hitch. Cloth.....	.50
History and Economics. By J. E. Sinclair. Paper05
How I Acquired My Millions. By a Big Capitalist. Paper05
Human, All Too Human. By Friedrich Nietzsche. Cloth50
Human Aptitudes. By C. Osborne Ward. Cloth	1.50
Imprudent Marriages. By Robert Blatchford. Paper05
Industrial Democracy. By J. W. Kelley. Paper05
Industrial Unionism: Its Economic Necessity. By William E. Trautman. Paper..	.05
Industry and Democracy. By Lewis J. Duncan. Paper05
Intemperance and Poverty. By T. Twining. Paper05
Kingdom of God and Socialism, The. By Rev. Robert M. Webster. Paper.....	.05
Labor Catechism of Political Economy, A. By C. Osborne Ward. Cloth.....	1.00
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism. (Anti-Duehring). By Frederick Engels. Cloth	1.00
Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association, The. By Isaac Broome. Cloth..	.50
Life and Death. By Dr. E. Teichmann. Cloth	.50
Life of Frederick Engels. By Karl Kautsky. Paper10
Looking Forward. By Philip Rappaport. Cloth	1.00
Love's Coming of Age. By Edward Carpenter. Cloth	1.00
Making of the World, The. By Dr. M. Wilhelm Meyer. Cloth50
Manifesto de la Komunista Partio. English and Esperanto. Cloth.50
Manifesto of the Communist Party. By Marx and Engels. Cloth, 50 cents; paper,....	.10
Man Under the Machine, The. By A. M. Simons. Paper05
Marxian Economics. By Ernest Untermann. Cloth	1.00
Marx on Cheapness. Translated by Robert Rives LaMonte. Paper05
Memoirs of Karl Marx. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Cloth50
Merrie England. By Robert Blatchford. Paper10

Mission of the Working Class, The. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. Paper05
Modern Socialism. By Charles H. Vail. Cloth75
Paper25
Morals and Socialism. By Kerr; also The Odd Trick. By Bax. Paper05
Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. By Frederick Engels. Cloth..	.50
Our Bourgeois Literature: The Reason and the Remedy. By Upton Sinclair. Paper..	.05
Packingtown: A Study of the Chicago Stock Yards. By A. M. Simons. Paper.....	.05
Passing of Capitalism, The. By Isador Laddoff. Cloth, 50 cents; paper.....	.25
Perfecting the Earth. By Dr. C. W. Wooldridge. Cloth	1.00
Philosophy of Socialism, The. By A. M. Simons. Paper05
Physical Basis of Mind and Morals. By M. H. Fitch. Cloth	1.00
Plutocracy or Nationalism, Which? By Edward Bellamy. Paper05
Positive Outcome of Philosophy. By Joseph Dietzgen. Cloth	1.00
Positive School of Criminology, The. By Enrico Ferri. Cloth50
Principles of Scientific Socialism. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. Cloth, \$1.00; paper....	.35
Pride of Intellect, The. By Franklin H. Wentworth. Paper05
Pullman Strike, The. By W. H. Carwardine. Paper25
Rational Prohibition. By Walter L. Young. Paper05
Real Religion of Today, The. By Rev. William Thurston Brown. Paper.....	.05
Recent Progress of the Socialist Movement. By Morris Hillquit. Paper.....	.10
Realism in Literature and Art. By Clarence S. Darrow. Paper05
Rebel at Large, The. By May Beals. Cloth...	.50
Rebels of the New South. By Walter Marion Raymond. Cloth	1.00
Recording Angel, The. By Edwin Arnold Brenholtz. Cloth	1.00
Relation of Religion to Social Ethics, The. By William Thurston Brown. Paper.....	.05
Republic of Plato. Translated by Alexander Kerr. Books I, II, III, IV, V and VI. Each, paper15
Republic, The. By N. P. Andresen. Cloth...	1.00

Revolution and Counter-Revolution. By Karl Marx. Cloth50
Right to Be Lazy, and Other Studies. By Paul Lafargue. Cloth50
Revolutionary Essays in Socialist Faith and Fancy. By Peter E. Burrowes. Cloth... .	1.00
Rise of the American Proletarian. By Austin Lewis. Cloth	1.00
Root of All Kinds of Evil. By Rev. Stewart Sheldon. Paper10
Russian Bastille, The. By Simon O. Pollock. Cloth50
Sale of an Appetite, The. By Paul Lafargue. Cloth50
Scab, The. By Jack London. Paper.....	.05
Science and Revolution. By Ernest Unter- mann. Cloth50
Science and Socialism. By Robert Rives La- Monte. Paper05
Science and the Workingman. By Ferdinand Lassalle. Paper25
Shoes, Pigs and Problems. By Evelyn Gladys. Paper05
Single Tax Versus Socialism. By A. M. Sim- ons. Paper05
Sketch of Social Evolution, A. By H. W. Boyd Mackay. Paper05
Social and Philosophical Studies. By Paul Lafargue. Cloth50
Social Revolution, The. By Karl Kautsky. Cloth50
Socialism and Farmers. By A. M. Simons. Paper05
Socialism and Philosophy. By Antonio Lab- riola. Cloth	1.00
Socialism and Slavery. By H. M. Hyndman. Paper05
Socialism and the Home. By May Walden. Paper05
Socialism and the Organized Labor Move- ments. By May Wood Simons. Paper... .	.05
Socialist and Trade Unionism. By Daniel Lynch and Max S. Hayes. Paper.....	.05
Socialism in French Municipalities. Trans- lated from Official Reports. Paper.....	.05
Socialism, Positive and Negative. By Robert Rives La Monte. Cloth.50
Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism. By Gabriel Deville. Paper.....	.10
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Freder- ick Engels. Cloth, 50 cents; paper.....	.10

Socialism vs. Anarchy. By A. M. Simons. Paper05
Socialism vs. Single Tax. A Debate. Paper..	.25
Socialism, What It Is and What It Seeks to Accomplish. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Pa- per10
Socialist Catechism. By Charles E. Cline. Pa- per05
Socialist Movement, The. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. Paper10
Socialist Party of America, Platform, Meth- ods, etc. The. Paper05
Socialist Songs. By William Morris and others. Paper05
Socialist Songs with Music. Compiled by Charles H. Kerr. Paper10
Socialist Songs, Dialogues and Recitations. Compiled by Josephine R. Cole. Paper...	.25
Socialist View of Mr. Rockefeller, A. By John Spargo. Paper05
Socialists, The. By John Spargo. Cloth.....	.50
Paper10
Socialization of Humanity, The. By Charles Kendall Franklin. Cloth	2.00
Some of the Philosophical Essays of Joseph Dietzgen. Cloth	1.00
State and Socialism, The. By Gabriel Deville. Paper10
Stories of the Struggle. By Morris Winchev- sky. Cloth50
Ten Blind Leaders of the Blind. By Arthur M. Lewis. Cloth50
Theoretical System of Karl Marx, The. By Louis B. Boudin. Cloth50
Thoughts of a Fool. By Evelyn Gladys. Cloth	1.00
Triumph of Life, The. By Wilhelm Boelsche. Cloth50
Trust Question, The. By Rev. Charles H. Vail. Paper05
Trusts and Imperialism. By H. Gaylord Wil- shire. Paper05
Underfed School Children. By John Spargo. Paper10
Under the Lash. A Drama in five acts. By C. F. Quinn. Paper25
Universal Kinship, The. By J. Howard Moore. Cloth	1.00
Useful Work Versus Useless Toil. By Wil- liam Morris. Paper05
Value, Price and Profit. By Karl Marx. Cloth	.50
Paper10

Wage Labor and Capital. By Karl Marx. Paper05
Walt Whitman: A Study. By Mila Tupper Maynard. Cloth	1.00
What Are We Here For? By F. Dundas Todd. Paper50
What's So and What Isn't. By John M. Work. Cloth50
What Socialists Think. By Charles H. Kerr. Paper05
What the Socialists Would Do If They Won in This City. By A. M. Simons. Paper05
When Things Were Doing. By C. A. Steere. Cloth	1.00
Where We Stand, American Socialism Explained. By John Spargo. Paper05
Why a Workingman Should Be a Socialist. By Gaylord Wilshire. Paper05
Why I Am a Socialist. By George D. Herron. Paper05
Wolves, The. By Robert A. Wason. Paper10
Woman and Socialism. By May Walden. Paper05
Woman and the Social Problem. By May Wood Simons. Paper05
Woman Under Socialism. By August Bebel. Cloth	1.00
World's Revolutions, The. By Ernest Unter- mann. Cloth50

Any book in this list mailed promptly on receipt of price. We do **not** allow credit; we do **not** sell books of other publishers; we do **not** receive subscriptions for any periodical except the **International Socialist Review**. This is an 80-page monthly, every page intensely interesting to active socialists. A **Study Course in Socialism**, conducted by Joseph E. Cohen, started in the issue for November, 1908. Ten cents a copy, 25 cents for 3 months; 50 cents for 6 months; \$1.00 a year. Address

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY (Co-operative)
153 EAST KINZIE STREET
CHICAGO

Lafargue's Books

Paul Lafargue is one of the ablest and beyond doubt the most charming of the socialist writers of Europe. Charles H. Kerr has translated three of his books.

Social and Philosophical Studies shows how people's ideas of religion, justice and goodness are definitely related to the mode of production by which their material wants are satisfied.

The Right to Be Lazy and Other Studies contains six clear, strong essays appealing to the self-interest and the common sense of the wage-workers exploited under capitalism.

The Sale of an Appetite, illustrated with original drawings by Dorothy Deene, is a powerful, realistic story of a typical wage-worker.

Each volume sold separately in cloth at 50 cents, postpaid.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY

153 East Kinzie St., Chicago

THE COMMON SENSE OF SOCIALISM


A Series of Letters Addressed to
Jonathan Edwards, of Pittsburg

By JOHN SPARGO

THIS is Mr. Spargo's latest and best book, and it is just the thing for a busy man or woman who wants the case for socialism plainly and pleasantly stated in a volume of moderate size. It is scientific, yet easy and readable. It is fearless, yet good-tempered. It will make votes that will stick.

Cloth, \$1.00; paper, 25 cents; postpaid.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
153 KINZIE STREET CHICAGO



14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

23 Nov '57 PT	5 Jan '63 BB
REC'D LD	
NOV 13 1957	REC'D LD
27 May 58 FHP	JAN 16 1963
REC'D LD	MAY 16 1968 53
MAY 13 1958	RECEIVED
27 Mar '59 JT	MAY 27 '68 4 PM
	LOAN DEPT.
REC'D LD	
APR 21 1959	

1000

THE

